

CONTENTS

VOLUME 1

NUMBER 3

JULY 1956

Editor's Page 2

No Man Is an Island AGNES E. MEYER 3

Leisure: Bane or Blessing? MARVIN B. SUSSMAN 11

Religion and Social Work SUE SPENCER 19

Publicize, Interpret or Relate? GERTRUDE BINDER 27

A Juvenile Court Helps Parents JUDGE NATHAN J. KAUFMAN 32

Social Group Work and Group Psychotherapy SAUL SCHEIDLINGER, Ph.D. 36

Orthodoxy and Paradoxes: Dilemmas of Social Work Education
KATHERINE A. KENDALL, Ph.D. 43

A New Concept of Supervision Is Tested
RUTH NEWTON STEVENS and FRED A. HUTCHINSON 50

Dynamics of Teamwork in the Agency, Community, and Neighborhood
RALPH M. KRAMER 56

Group Work Section: Systematizing Social Group Work Practice
JACOB I. HURWITZ, Ph.D. 63

Medical Social Work Section: Research in a Medical Setting JENNIE MOHR, Ph.D. 70

Psychiatric Social Work Section: Clinicians in the School LESTER PEDDY 78

School Social Work Section: Working with Parents SANDRA D. ARBIT 86

Social Work Research Section: Public Perspectives on Social Security
MORRIS JANOWITZ 94

Points and Viewpoints 102

Book Reviews 114

Letters 126

Editor's Page

AS WITH MOST of the professions, social work is in a period of rapid transition. In fact, the demands of new knowledge, the expanding fields of practice, the challenge of leadership are such as to suggest a revolutionary rather than a comfortable evolutionary movement.

The practitioner of today is no longer a technician, but a professional person. While the demands for technical competence are stronger and sharper than ever, mastery of the *principles* of practice has become essential to performance. During the twenties the technical processes in social work received major emphasis, but after the depression and the war, great social changes required that the practitioner become a social worker in the fullest sense of the word. As government assumed responsibility for basic human needs, social and human needs became "rights," just as earlier civil and political needs had become rights. In the twenties and thirties social casework made enormous strides because of its incorporation of dynamic psychiatry, especially since these new insights suggested the possibility of a science of personality. Communication between social work and the other social sciences, however, was almost impossible, both because of the stage of development of each and the attitudes on both sides which kept the practitioner and the scientist apart. Alienation from the social sciences combined with overexposure to the medical specialty of psychiatry tended to produce in some respects a psychiatric technician.

Technique tends to become ritual. Technology in the physical world is leading toward the incredible phenomenon of automation and overemphasis on technique in the professions certainly leads to a kind of stereomation—to coin a word—which is inimical to the purpose of social work.

In the current scene extraordinary things are happening which deeply affect the present and future of social work. The social sciences are becoming more accessible, more

vital, more usable. Research is ceasing to be a dogma or a fashion, but is now a tool within professional practice. This is not the place to debate the merits of pure versus applied science, but it is appropriate to point out that the Golden Age of Medicine seemed to occur when the physical sciences, despite great resistance, became incorporated into the medical school, changing the profile of the clinician as the only ego ideal into the new practitioner of medicine. In a similar fashion, the interaction of social science and social work will alter the image, responsibilities, and goals of our profession.

It would, of course, be naive to think of the social sciences rushing to the rescue. The social scientist—now that he has become respectable—sometimes adorns himself in a frock coat and walks aloofly. If a science—or at least an on-going theory—of society as well as of personality is to motivate behavior, pure theory, now and then, must put on a sweat shirt and labor along with the rest of mankind.

Social work, directed as it is toward human needs and social services through interpersonal relationships, is probably the most complex of all the professions. Not only must it ally itself with the discoveries of social science, but its contribution will be limited—if not arid—unless the great humanistic insights underlie its value system.

What does this mean as to the policy of this journal? Is it too much to hope that we shall see ourselves less as technicians and more as social workers carrying forward the ideals of a humanistic people? In the leading paper, Agnes Meyer calls social workers to action—to make social welfare leaders politically conscious. This journal calls on us as contributors and readers to apply our keenest insights to the problems not only of personality but of society. With these considerations in mind the Editorial Board has begun to develop manuscript policy and standards for the journal and its readers, some of which appear on page 102.

G. H.

Social Work

BY AGNES E. MEYER

No Man Is an Island

THE PREDOMINANT MOOD of the American people is reflected in the quotations most often to be found in current writing. Last year Donne's sentence "No man is an island" had great currency. It indicated a hopeful desire for a world of brotherhood. Now the verses most frequently found are A. E. Housman's lines:

And how am I to face the odds
Of man's bedevilment and God's?
I a stranger and afraid
In a world I never made.

In spite of all our talk about peace and prosperity, the popularity of this poem reveals the underlying melancholy of many Americans. It suggests that most Americans today lead lives—to use Thoreau's words—of quiet desperation. And the significant words in this poem are *stranger* and *afraid*. But Housman is mistaken when he says ours is a world we never made. Who else made it? And if we made it, we can remake it nearer to the heart's desire, so that poets as well as the average citizen will no longer feel themselves strangers to it and no longer feel afraid of the future.

AGNES E. MEYER, well-known civic leader, author, and journalist, gave the address on which this article is based at the annual Alumni Day of the New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, New York, N. Y., April 14, 1956.

If I have the courage to discuss this moral imperative to make our nation and all other nations a better place in which to live, it is because I am convinced the schools of social work and their graduates can lead the way toward this democratic goal more effectively than any other profession. I am writing not as a professional but as a citizen—as a citizen, moreover, who is profoundly disturbed about the dismal reactionary trends to be discerned in our country, and the fact that at this critical period there is not enough social statesmanship to counteract the creeping nihilism that has begun to paralyze our thought and aspirations.

SOCIAL STATESMANSHIP

To one who has lived so long in Washington, it has become clear that we cannot depend upon politicians alone for the solution of our grave and numerous social problems. Most of them, when the chips are down, will be influenced by pressure groups and refuse to tell the electorate unpopular truths. Instead of trying to make our political leaders socially minded, I see far more hope for the future in trying to make our social leaders politically minded. Indeed, it puzzles me that the social workers and, for that matter, our educators allowed themselves to be pushed clear out of the political arena. Surely they, like the

members of any other profession, are citizens with all the rights and privileges of citizenship. And since many of our most crucial problems fall within their province, it seems to me high time that they write themselves a new declaration of independence.

For what we must think out today is a balance between our country's material growth and the social ideals of a humanistic society. An ever increasing rate of production is essential to our dynamic society. But we will fall into the Communist fallacy if we believe that rapidity of material development will automatically guarantee the good life. The other fallacy we can fall into is to ignore the material basis essential to spiritual striving. It is our problem to find the middle ground, a social philosophy of balanced material and human welfare.

Today, alas, there are powerful forces in our land that are hostile to this middle ground or liberal philosophy. These reactionary mentalities fear democracy, human freedom, equal rights, and equal opportunity for all—everything in which we believe. As a result, we are drifting aimlessly while our social problems grow more numerous every day. The idea that the good society can come into being automatically as the result of free enterprise, technology, and production is gaining adherents even in our country. The signs that we are falling behind in the race to establish a healthy, balanced society are almost too numerous to mention. The very fact that we boast of our prosperity while refusing to pass legislation to build an adequate number of schools, the delinquency and disaffection of the young, the mounting disregard for law and order, the growing distrust of intellect and knowledge, the pathetic confidence in the magic power of the indispensable man, these are but a few of the more obvious symptoms that we have a battle on our hands, if we are going to turn the tide of reaction and make our country strong enough to defend the free-

dom of mankind here at home and throughout the world. The chief battle, therefore, is not with an external enemy. It lies within ourselves and our own institutions. It is a battle that calls for social statesmanship of the highest order—of thoroughly studied, nationwide plans for the reorganization of community life where character is molded by the quality of human relationships. And I do not know where such constructive leadership can originate if not in our schools of social work.

A NEW PHASE FOR SOCIAL WORK

Let me not convey the impression that I think social work as a profession has been remiss. On the contrary. Within my own lifetime the concept of social work and its function in our society has made progress that is truly amazing. When I was at college, we knew social work, if we heard of it at all, in terms of settlements, institutions for children (for orphans and delinquents), the "charity organization societies," and friendly concern for the "deserving poor." Public welfare was nonexistent. Thirty years ago Abraham Flexner stated categorically that social work could not be considered a profession. Today, though standards for some phases of social work are as yet ill defined, the recognition that social work is a profession is generally accepted.

Surely you have the right to take courage when you think of the transformation that has taken place in that short period. At the same time, it must be conceded that social work—like much of our thinking—is still bogged down in a nineteenth-century, preindustrial individualism that has little relevance to the conditions created by the mass civilization of our day. The treatment of the individual in social work, as in medicine, is of vital importance both for humane reasons and as a guide, first to mass treatment and then to prevention. But just as the medical schools are now teaching their students to study the whole

Social Work

No Man Is an Island

human being, so the schools of social work must teach their students to study society as a corporate whole. Social work has once more come to a new phase of development: it must deal with mass situations and move on to preventive work on a gigantic scale. It must develop the co-operative leadership that will bring to bear our immense but scattered resources of scientific knowledge on the acute problems of the day.

No other profession can do this as readily as social workers, provided they do not lose themselves in trying to be psychiatrists, psychologists, doctors, anthropologists, and economists all rolled into one. They must see their profession as distinct in its philosophy and in its practical functions.

PHILOSOPHICAL BASE

Let us first consider the importance of philosophical orientation. It is based on the premise that social workers believe in democratic principles, democracy's faith in human nature and its potentialities, and the right of every individual to develop those potentialities to his fullest extent. What social workers need, therefore, are strong convictions about the central significance of social work in reorganizing our democratic society, advancing human welfare, and promoting social progress. That in itself is a fighting faith today. For pessimism about democracy is rampant among the so-called neo-Conservatives. They scorn the idea of progress because every step forward reveals new problems, though the only alternative is to let them all pile up until they overwhelm us. The neo-Conservatives equate liberalism with Communism. We are admonished to give up rational social planning as dangerous. In an era that must construct a new morality through better human relations, new institutions, and new legal provisions consonant with the needs of the day, we are advised by the neo-Conservatives to rely on "well-tried habits, institutions, and codes of

law." A country that was founded on the rejection of tradition is now being persuaded by the neo-Conservatives to see in the blind acceptance of tradition the cure for all evil.

At the same time the new insights of the behavioral sciences are being applied with the greatest success by the public relations experts. They use psychology more skillfully than the psychologists, and they sell personalities and ideas to our mass society with exactly the same skill that they sell toothpaste. Why are they so successful while objective, rational leadership, which tries to help people understand their problems, think for themselves, and act independently, labors in vain to reach the masses? The love of conformity, of standardization, of running with the herd is no accident. It is due to the fact that people are isolated in our chaotic society. Individuals are detached from their old ties of family, neighborhood, and community relationships by which their characters were forged in earlier days. Yet new allegiances and loyalties have not been created that can give our people a new center of being and a new order of life. As a consequence, individuals are confused and bewildered. They live in a vacuum. They are emotionally unemployed. This is the age of longing. Today a secular Milton could write another epic on "Community Lost" and "Community Regained" that would touch the hearts of all free men. Unless thoughtful and responsible social leadership arises that will help people achieve their own unique personalities through relationship to a meaningful world, the public relations experts will soon be ruling the country and even fooling the masses into thinking that self-government still exists.

What, then, should be the philosophical objectives of social work in the light of this critical situation? The chief function of intelligence is to foresee future changes and guide them. Our environmental conditions are now changing at an ever accelerated tempo. That is why the neo-Conservatives

who want to maintain the *status quo* are unable to develop a program. There is no such animal as a *status quo* in a society as dynamic as ours. But we liberals will become equally futile if we merely look forward sentimentally without developing a positive answer to our problems. The question is whether intelligence can become a directive factor or whether we shall continue to drift along as heedlessly as we have ever since the industrial revolution began with steam, was augmented by electricity, and is now being thrown into high gear with automation and the peaceful use of atomic energy. The only way to put an end to neutrality and drift is to foresee the consequences of these new forces. Then and only then can we take action to bring about consequences that seem desirable. Only when we observe the connection between cause and effect can we begin to choose between alternatives, to plan and to guide our human destinies. Only by such means can we create a decent civilization in which people can form the stable habits which are called morality.

IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH

That is why research is of prime importance and should receive financial support from all persons who are concerned about the future of our country. The first condition for the solution of a problem is to become aware of its existence and its causes. To be sure, research will have much spade work to do before it can arrive at a program for action, gathering the findings of existing research work and acting as a clearinghouse for the philosophy of social work and its practical application. But from my own study of such materials, I find it frequently too preoccupied with enumeration, description, and techniques, or with pure theory, and all too often it speaks a language which I have called *desperanto*. To be sure, new methods for improving existing social programs are essential, especially new methods of admin-

istration. But what is needed now is a broad vision of how we got where we are and what to do about it. Why are our people falling into two main psychological categories—a numbness of complacency or despairing discontent? Why do we jump from one mass hysteria to the next? Why do we feel and think alike—and yet why are we so divided? The distinctive qualities of individuality are suppressed and yet we are incapable of unity. Why does the sensational personality, whose aura is often created by public relations experts, exercise such an hypnotic uniformity of response? Why did so few people criticize our political leadership when injustice, disregard for legal procedure, and flagrant attacks on innocent people swept the land and still prevail in many security cases? These are not mere accidental phenomena. They are rooted in social conditions. Yet we have no reliable analyses of the underlying causes of these phenomena and, therefore, no strong impulse to cure what we know can become fatal maladies. These and similar manifestations must be tackled by research, for they involve complex forces that are active throughout our country and indeed throughout the Western world. The supreme task of social workers in a confused epoch such as ours is not to share its confusion.

Whatever the curriculum (which is not within my province), it must free the personalities of the students rather than freeze them, as is now too often the result in social work training, especially in the field of casework. Leadership qualities may be largely innate but they can be discouraged if the schools of social work make no effort to stimulate them. This means less emphasis on technological minutiae and more on our major problems, purposes, and goals. Imagination, freedom of thought and of experimentation must be encouraged by faculty members who themselves have a broad vision and leadership abilities—the ability to inspire and to stimulate thinking.

Now let us consider why social work is

Social Work

No Man Is an Island

in a unique position from the functional point of view. Social workers are strategically placed in the community and in the social scene as a whole to act as a link between our immense army of volunteers and the various social scientists who are as yet far too isolated in their colleges and universities. Those schools of social work that are closely associated with a great university are in the best position to bridge the gap which now exists between practice and theory in social endeavor. In drawing upon the social scientists to augment their faculties, they are taking a major step in training not merely social workers but social statesmen.

BREAKING DOWN THE WALL

But I am calling upon social workers to do far more than that—I am asking them to break down the wall that now exists between the citizen-volunteers who are trying to solve their community problems and the know-how and the know-why that exist in abundance within the consecrated walls of academe. For too many of our most gifted social scientists, like the sailor on his ship, have a consciousness of complete independence of land affairs and not a little contempt for the poor earthworms who cannot escape from them.

Our nation has advanced in material power beyond that of all others because the industrial application of scientific knowledge has made the greatest strides in our industrial society. Yet we have not learned to apply this scientific knowledge to the massive human problems which our technological progress has created. If the disintegration of community life is to be arrested (and this I think is our central problem), the groping and fumbling of public and private welfare work must now give way to more intelligently planned co-operative action in the social and political fields. And by planning I mean nothing different from what goes on in industry, namely, the application of foresight and knowledge toward its future development.

The schools of social work are in an ideal position to achieve this and thus help local initiative to go forward less wastefully, less spasmodically, and more efficiently. The average businessman would be less afraid of "social planning" if it were made clear to him that we seek to bring about what he is already doing, achieving better human relations through scientific management. The business world is our most progressive world because it is alert, knowledgeable, and plans its future on the basis of exact research. That is why it combines stability with vitality. The community has remained unstable and its tensions increase every day because it lacks these advantages.

The instinct for social action, which is so strong in our people, must now be fused with the science of social action. On the community level, this calls for social workers with across-the-board training and a special knowledge in one field. It calls for adroitness in moving easily amongst all kinds of people—something I can only describe as social diplomacy—guided by definite purposes and the tact to make those purposes acceptable to the whole plethora of local leaders. That implies administrative capacity of a high quality. The sheer immensity of the task of community reorganization, the persuasion, debate, and compromise it requires, and the factual research which must illuminate the discussion, can come about in no other way. The all-prevailing tendency in our country today is to fear progress, to accept conformity of thought, and to call everyone a socialist who recommends change. If continued, this can only lead to dangerous animosities in our country and to the open conflict which at this very moment is gaining headway in the South over the segregation issue. In the complex Southern situation there is a crying need for the application of psychology, sociology, anthropology, and political science to counteract the emotionalism which may light flames of intolerance throughout our nation. At the same time this crucial problem must be seen as merely

a more acute form of the irrationalism and anti-intellectualism, the intolerance and group hostilities, which exist in every community. Thus we are all at fault—not merely the Southern politicians—for this alarming rebellion against the Supreme Court. Instead of criticizing the South, we should use it as a laboratory for the application of social engineering of the highest quality. While working on migratory labor problems throughout the South, I met numerous Negro professionals, businessmen, and other cultivated people whose very existence was unknown to the white population in the same city. Merely bringing educated Negro and educated white community leaders together for rational discussion is a major task. Here is a superb opportunity for our psychologists, anthropologists, and political scientists to test their knowledge through its practical application. Why all the clamor for academic freedom, if that freedom is not used to preserve the freedom of our nation and of mankind?

Why shouldn't the schools of social work urge the President to appoint a biracial federal commission in which voluntary and scientific leadership are combined? This would lead to the formation of similar commissions on a state and local level. For in the long run the integration of our schools is a local problem, if only because the proportion of Negro to white children differs in every school district. If we continue to let the tensions between Negro and white citizens grow more acute in the South, we run the risk of increased rioting such as happened at Alabama University. And if our scientific insight into human motivations and our ability to guide human behavior are not sufficiently developed to prevent local warfare, how are we ever going to learn to prevent international warfare?

TRANSLATING THEORY INTO ACTION

With that question I bring you one of the greatest problems with which the social work schools must cope. Let's face it. At

present many—perhaps most—of our academic social scientists do not feel free to speak their minds, much less enter the arena of daily combat in the open market place. Such freedom as our social scientists enjoy is usually in direct proportion to their remoteness from the hurly-burly of everyday life and its agonies. Unless the schools of social work now have the courage to act as a bridge between theory and action, and translate the accumulated knowledge of the scientists into practical programs, the thinking of our social scientists will become more and more theoretical to the point of developing another form of scholasticism. The natural scientist has achieved freedom because he is needed to produce practical results in every field of industry. The social scientist is fettered by man's habitual fear of change.

Even the teachers in our public high schools are afraid to discuss the acute social problems with which every community is afflicted. If the schools of social work want recruits who have a genuine interest in following social work as a career, they must develop clear-cut plans, methods, and a philosophy that would give both high school and college teachers the courage to discuss them freely. Thus, if our scientific knowledge is actually to be used to heighten the quality of everyday life, the schools of social work must be prepared for an active battle to reassert the vital role of intelligence and the trained mind in human progress.

The present social chaos is due more than anything else to our failure to face the realities of our industrial society, a failure in which the schools of social work must assume their share of blame. A consciously directed, critical consideration of the state of present society is a precondition for the projection of constructive ideas. The other professions as well as the general public have to be stimulated until a sense of the need and the opportunity for community reorganization takes hold upon a large number of minds. In the very act of par-

No Man Is an Island

icipating in such a process the American people will forge not only a new, more integrated society but something they need equally as much—new, more integrated and more individualistic and independent personalities.

LEADERSHIP ROLE

As the conscience of our American society it is the mission of social work to accept this role of leadership. To be sure, the other major professions—the law, medicine, education—should also contribute leadership to this daring enterprise. But these older professions have become encrusted in bureaucracy, respectability, and economic rewards. Social work is still free—to some extent—from this lockstep toward success which most Americans worship. It is, therefore, at a critical period in the development of its future. Do social workers want to play it safe and imitate the history of all the older professions? Or do they want to be the yeast that will leaven the lump of the mass civilization that democracy threatens to become? I urge at this critical period in our nation's history that social work accept the role of an objective but inexorable critic of our society, whatever the risk may be. The mark of the vital democratic spirit is to know its way, to invent new means to achieve new ends.

I cannot visualize this role more heroically than did the sociologist, C. Wright Mills: "You have as thinkers to transcend the milieu in which you work and continually to try to grasp the structural trends of your epoch. You have as thinkers to debunk, with all the force and irony at your command, those who do not see this need and are theoretically sunk in one milieu or another. You have as thinkers continually to refresh your knowledge of great historic trends and your awareness of great ideals for man in order that you may feel secure that your limited powers to act and to advise might be used to the optimum."

Who knows and who can find out better than social workers what is wrong, stupid, and unjust in our social scene? Who better than social workers can discern the paths that we must travel toward a better and a happier America? If social workers act as a catalyst of our scientific knowledge and defend their findings with ample facts, then the millions of volunteer workers like myself will have the leadership we so sorely need. The American people, as a whole, are ready to defend and to follow such leadership. I know from bitter experience that the individual cannot fight the battle for social progress singlehanded with any hope of success. In a mass society we must learn to use the highly developed techniques of mass communication. There is nothing inherently immoral in these methods. Like atomic energy they can be used for good as well as for evil, for constructive as well as destructive purposes. They can be aimed at the mind as well as the conditioned reflexes. The problems in every community are fundamentally the same. But before we can persuade the American people to accept an integrated program for social betterment on a nationwide scale, it must be clearly outlined for them on factual evidence by social work leaders who can command their confidence. If it is set forth in exact, simple, and persuasive language that everyone can understand, the latent good will of our people will spring into action and transform our chaotic society into one that satisfies their deep yearnings to live a life of warmth and meaningful association with family, neighbors, and friends.

In social work lies the responsibility to create the preconditions for concerted action that will give the word "neighborhood" a new vitality and content. The application of a program leading to community solidarity can be as various as life will always be in a truly free democracy. But its objective will be the same, to re-establish the relationships and attachments

that are the source of the deepest human influences and the highest human satisfactions. From such roots a stronger national community could grow, for the quality of our national leadership, whether in public or private life, depends upon the educative values of local popular association. Then and only then is the great community conceivable. The work of this new world community would be reflected not only in freer international relations but would be reflected back into the local com-

munity, broadening the experience of our people and all other people.

There is the vision of the role of social work in national and international affairs that I consider well within its capacities to study and to realize. It is a responsibility calling for the highest social statesmanship, a responsibility for which history has no parallel, but one that must be undertaken without loss of time if our nation is to fulfill its destiny as the guardian of human freedom.

BY MARVIN B. SUSSMAN

Leisure: Bane or Blessing?

IS LEISURE A bane or a blessing? Perhaps it is both. The fact that we have abundant free time is a blessing; how we use it may be a bane. "Technology," according to George Soule, "has mastered the art of saving time, but not the art of spending it,"¹ and herein lies one of our problems. The wise use of leisure may result in abundant blessings. Man needs freedom from routine and conformity, time to develop latent talents and to express inner cravings for artistic and aesthetic experience. Man's energies are plentiful and channeling them into creative directions is a continuing concern.

In looking at leisure we cannot ignore its relation to work. Leisure today is superseding work in importance in our society. This shift of orientation from work to leisure has been long in coming. The changes during the last thirty years should have prepared us to meet the new life interests of people. Agencies devoted to the recreational, welfare, and social needs of people have given little provocative thought or creative action to meet this shift. The old wine, *i.e.*, traditional patterns and programs, is being placed into new bottles; agencies are scurrying into the suburbs where the rich and the not-so-rich are moving and the prescribed medicine is more and more of the same type of activities, structures, and functions befitting an earlier period.

My thesis is that there is a new outlook toward leisure in American society and with few exceptions those individuals who should be most concerned do not perceive

this or care to. In view of the "new outlook" I suggest an examination of current thinking and practice in regard to leisure. To do this I wish to treat leisure in relation to the work situation of man, the changing conditions of work, attitudes, and orientations toward it; and leisure practices related to class and family problems. Finally, I will make a few suggestions concerning the planning and organization of activities in this new era of leisure.

WORK: FUTURE, PAST, AND PRESENT

The workweek is growing increasingly shorter with the development of mechanized and automatic industrial processes. Recently, Haig Babian, a New York University economist, stated that by 1975 there will be a four-day workweek of 32 hours, a population of 220,000,000, and an average family income of \$8,000 by today's standards.² Another observer, David Wendt, former science education director for UNESCO, sees the new era of leisure arriving even sooner. By 1961 a three-day weekend will be the rule rather than the exception. Optimistically he predicts, "The age of materialism is about over and the new interest in leisure activities will be creative."³ The obvious fact is that there has been and will continue to be a gradual reduction of the workweek. How has this change been affecting the workers in industry? What were the conditions of family and factory life prior to this change and how did individuals adjust to it?

The impact of industrialization and urbanization upon human behavior is a

MARVIN B. SUSSMAN is associate professor of sociology, Western Reserve University. A modified version of this paper was presented to the Health and Welfare Institute, Cleveland, Ohio, in March 1956.

¹ *Time for Living* (New York: The Viking Press, 1955), p. 100.

² *New York University Alumni News*, Vol. 1 (February 1956), p. 3.

³ "Scientist Sights 32-Hour Week as Rule by 1961," *The Cleveland Plain Dealer* (March 3, 1956).

well-known story. It has had a profound effect upon the organization and functions of the modern family. We have shifted somewhat from the large-sized, independent, self-reliant, homogeneous, and integrated preindustrial family to the smaller-sized, relatively isolated, less well-integrated, individual-centered family.

At the onset of the industrial revolution the idea of bringing people together to work on a given task or tasks under central supervision meant that peasants, farmers, yeomen, and others went from the farms and villages and rural type of culture to the newly mushrooming cities of England, Western Europe, and the United States. Writers of that period wondered how repetitive and routine factory work would affect the personalities of workers. Changes to urban ways did occur and they were gradual. Work and the new industrial order rested largely upon the moral and religious justification that the Reformation gave to it. Calvin reinterpreted the concept of work as a curse, everyone regardless of social position or condition of life had to work; work thus became spiritualized and for the selected few the means to divine providence.⁴

The association of religion with the value of work must have had a sobering and steadying effect upon the new industrial worker. Not so for Karl Marx and others who looked upon religion, if not as fostering the brutish aspects of early factory life, then at least as condoning them. Marx viewed the factory system full of inhumanity and containing the seeds of its own destruction.

Perhaps the change for the worker from the farm to the city was not as great as it first appeared. Indeed, the new city worker was losing his rural habits and values. With nostalgia he could look back on his former life where he had a view of

the sky, earth, and trees, a former life which conveyed a sense of belonging to the soil. Yet this rural existence could not have been a very exciting one. The new city worker had in effect exchanged the boredom, sweat, routine toil of the farm for that of the factory. Surprisingly, he could take the boredom and passivity of the new situation. Moreover, once thrust into the factory, he sought to control it and soon did so through informal group structures and practices. Such practices currently identified as the slowdown, goldbricking, rumor spreading, story-telling, coffee breaks, and the development of certain work habits tended to make work during this early period, if not pleasant, then at least tolerable.

The worker during this dawn period of industry was not so badly off in regard to his opportunity for leisure as his later descendants, the workers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While this forerunner of modern industrial man had to work long hours, he still was not completely citized. In urban areas not yet giant metropolises, overcrowded with smelly tenements, our earlier city dweller could have a garden and in summers or during layoffs go off to the nearby streams or hills for outdoor recreation.

The growing industrial machine and its new culture changed this pattern. Work became central to man's thinking and behaving. Rural amenities disappeared and the growing complexity of city life soon was to cut him off almost completely from those activities outside the factory job. He became factory-oriented and the succeeding generations raised in the city became stamped with the factory culture.

The factory became the melting pot of America into which diverse nationality and racial groups worked and fought. Long hours had a stupefying effect on their family relationships. Coming home dog-tired, the breadwinner was scarcely a companion or teacher for his children, and he was considerably less than a companion for his wife. Soon fatigue and long hours be-

⁴ John Cohen has an excellent discussion on the concept of work in "The Ideas of Work and Play," *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 4 (December 1953), pp. 313-322.

Leisure: Bane or Blessing?

came points of counterattack by both unions and management. Tremendous sums of money have been spent on improving the conditions of the workplace by mechanization and in some cases by moving plants into the pleasant suburbs, and in "humanizing" interpersonal relationships within the plant.

Whatever these efforts to humanize work may be, man today is imprinted with a culture built upon the industrial system, one which emphasizes to such a great extent the value of work that it is hard for us to visualize the meaning or the impact of the new leisure. This new leisure is not a dream but a reality and we are psychologically and organizationally unprepared for it.

THE NEW LEISURE

The new leisure is reflected in the worker's changing conception of his life interests. In a recent well-conceived and executed research on the central life interests of industrial workers, Robert Dubin, sociologist at the University of Oregon, found that for almost three out of every four industrial workers studied, work and the workplace are not central interests.⁵ This finding is not to be confused with the notion that workers have lost the will to do an honest day's work, have lost ambition and the taste for workmanship (a belief held by Taylor, father of time study). Elton Mayo, in his researches at Western Electric, and students of small group behavior have demonstrated that restructured work groups and assembly lines can alleviate tension and monotony, provide variety, and increase production. Dubin's findings indicate that the orientation of the worker lies outside of the plant, a sharp contrast to the earlier Polish immigrant I once knew, whose complete life focused on the job and the social experiences derived from it. Dubin reports that only 10 percent of the industrial workers perceived their important primary

social relationship as taking place at work. The other 90 percent preferred primary interactions with fellow men elsewhere than on the job. Only 24 percent of the 491 studied could be labeled as job-oriented in their life interests. Dubin concludes that "the industrial man today seems to perceive his life history as having its center outside of work for his intimate human relationships and for his feelings of enjoyment, happiness, and worth. On the other hand, for his experiences with the technological aspects of his life space and for his participation in formal organizations he clearly recognizes the primacy of the workplace. In short, he has a well-developed sense of attachment to his work and workplace without a corresponding sense of total commitment to it."⁶

The Corning Glass Company conference held several years ago, a centennial celebration on the topic of "Creating an Industrial Civilization," gave supportive evidence that work is no longer the central life interest to workers and that these life interests have moved out into the community.⁷ Among many conclusions reached was the suggestion that particular attention should be paid to man's nonworking environment. Man seemed to prefer and to find his primary group relationships within the community. As long as man found desirable associations outside the factory, he could stand the impersonality and efficiency within the bureaucratic structure. Moreover, in the locale of the community man could be most creative in advancing our industrial society.

Riesman and his students at Chicago have reached similar conclusions. In one of his projects he is studying the steelworkers of Gary. He finds that their work today is leisurely and gregarious. It is no longer the twelve-hour day, nor is there the fatigue upon returning home I mentioned previously. Now at the big sheet and tube

⁵ "Industrial Workers' Worlds: A Study of the 'Central Life Interests' of Industrial Workers," *Social Problems*, Vol. 3 (January 1956), pp. 131-142.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

⁷ Eugene A. Staley, ed., *Creating an Industrial Civilization* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952).

mill in Gary, men often take naps on mattresses they bring in, cook meals on stoves attached to the fiery furnaces; if a new foreman protests, a slowdown of production continues until he likes it. Riesman reports that the heaviest of work in the mills today is so lacking in strain that the worker leaves the plant with a good deal of energy left, which carries him through his leisure hours.⁸ Strong unions have enabled the men to control their work situation. They use the slowdown every so often "to cut the management down to size," to break monotony, and to liven up the work situation.⁹

LEISURE AND SOCIAL CLASS

What does the worker do with his leisure? We know very little about this. Some of the Gary steelworkers are moving into a working-class residential suburb, one relatively undeveloped or unplanned and where taxes are low, buying a lot and building a comfortable and yet not pretentious home, doing most of their own work.

It should be noted that the worker of the old residential area and the new suburb has swelled the ranks of the "do-it-yourself" movement. This, by the way, is a turnback to the tradition of the handicraft era and probably has more social than economic implications. Since the "do-it-yourself" craze has been upped from the fad to the fashion, about 600,000 are injured each year while engaged in "do-it-yourself" projects.

Besides "do-it-yourself" and tending gardens, workers travel and go on hunting, fishing, and camping trips; others acquire a stock of hard goods of domesticity and provide a childhood for their children similar to those found in our middle-class suburbs, the one of "brownies, beanies, greenies and the like," one which they never experienced and now can give to their children. They support our athletic programs, flock to ball

parks, and when not active in sports such as softball and bowling, they are at least sedentary participants in professional sports.

It is safe to say that with the growing leisure of workers in our society the patterns of adjustment are similar to those of the middle classes. Increasingly, there is a filtering down of leisure-class patterns from the taste leaders at the top. The blue-collar worker off the job is becoming much like the office or white-collar worker in tastes and attitudes toward leisure. To some degree he still differs, in his willingness to buy consumer goods or in the way he spends his leisure. He is more experimental with new leisure forms and does not question whether they are worth while or a good thing for himself or his family. He looks upon the new gadget or innovation as good within itself, a mark of progress. Why question it? This notion was illustrated in two recent researches on the use and effects of television. Working-class and middle-class parents were interviewed concerning their attitudes toward TV; for the working class television was a logical extension of radio and movies, and a good thing in itself; there were no serious discussions as to its worthwhileness; but for many middle-class parents TV presented a problem, "Should we or shouldn't we?"¹⁰

The working class is collecting hard goods, experimenting in new leisure forms, and is sufficiently preoccupied to continue in this vein for some time to come.

LEISURE, FAMILY, AND SUBURBIA

Our middle classes, in contrast, those who work for a living in white-collar occupations and professions, are the style setters for leisure-time practices. Also, as a class, they have their problems. Two outstanding ones from my viewpoint are: first, the

⁸ David Riesman, "Some Observations on Changes in Leisure Attitudes," *The Antioch Review* (1952-53), p. 425.

⁹ Warner Bloomberg, Jr., "Gary's Industrial Workers as Full Citizens," *Commentary*, Vol. 18 (July 1954), p. 203.

¹⁰ Margaret Midas, "Without TV," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 3 (1951), pp. 152-66. This research was brought to my attention in a paper by David Riesman and Warner Bloomberg, Jr., "Work and Leisure: Fusion or Polarity?" (mimeographed publication of the Center for the Study of Leisure, University of Chicago).

Leisure: Bane or Blessing?

emphasis placed upon spending leisure time productively (doing it even if it kills me); and second, the proliferation of family activities according to sex and age levels to the point where leisure-time pursuits are individual rather than family oriented. Let us examine these two problems.

We live in a "keep busy" culture, constantly bent on improving ourselves, at least the Madison Avenue boys tell us so, and for the most part we believe it. Our families run to small numbers in size and we are "child centered" in that we try to provide the best for our children, at least covet opportunities for them which we did not have or had to create for ourselves. The result of trying to improve ourselves and develop proper social relationships by "integrating the child into his group of peers" or "fitting in with others" is conformity and neuroses in ourselves; and if our children have escaped these, at least they have their allergies.

Riesman reports on the recent research of John R. Seeley into the relationships between the school and community in what can be called a wealthy suburb.¹¹ The school system was one of the best in the state, paid the highest salaries, had the best equipment, intelligent people were on the school board; yet despite all this the community was not happy. To be sure, the parents were interested in their child's welfare, their education, and future adjustment in the society. They were concerned to the point of constantly judging their child's performance in school and his popularity outside. Was the child "adjusting" and engaging in leisure activities that would benefit him and make him feel that he belonged to his group of peers? These parents, college trained and educated, developed what I have called "the greenie-beanie routine." Mom not only became a short-order cook but chauffeur and scheduler as well, and Mary and Johnny went the round of dancing lessons, skating, golfing, music, riding, and partying. Parents also partook in this grooming process; while

their children played and acted, the parents met to schedule additional performances.

W. H. Whyte, Jr., in the *Fortune* series¹² on Park Forest, a suburb for the corporations' young transients outside of Chicago, describes adults and children as living in a "hotbed of participation." Participation is round the clock. On a typical weekday evening every room in the Protestant Sunday school is used. Sixty-six adult and countless children's organizations are active in this class-isolated mass-produced suburb.

Why are these folks so active? Whyte is uncertain. Perhaps it improves chances for promotion, or stems from the insecurity of being a transient. Residents want to be tied up with something, want to have allegiances and identities with the school, church, and community. Perhaps it is a training ground for later leadership. There is some question on this latter point. Community social life has served as a leveler for all and children have become part of the anonymous mass. The constant search for common values, group controls, lack of privacy, the "all-seeing eye" have retarded the development of individuality. Will the children raised in this environment become bold leaders, will they ever have the opportunity to "get sore at the system" and act assertively and perhaps creatively? This is doubtful. As one respondent remarked to Whyte, "I don't want to do anything to offend the people here. . . . But then once in a while I think of my husband and what we are not doing, and I get depressed. Is it just enough not to be bad?"¹³

In both communities, one characterized by stability and the other by transiency, people who apparently had abundant leisure time were playing too hard at the game of trying to have productive and creative leisure and were unwittingly creating anxiety for themselves and their families.

¹² This series of articles in *Fortune* is well worth reading. "The Transients" (May 1953); "The Future, c/o Park Forest" (June 1953); "The Outgoing Life" (July 1953); and "How the New Suburbia Socializes" (August 1953).

¹³ W. H. Whyte, Jr., "How the New Suburbia Socializes," *Fortune* (August 1953), p. 120.

¹¹ Riesman, *op. cit.*, p. 426.

They just weren't having fun. They pursued the life of arts and crafts with such intensity and dogged determination that the quality of leisureliness and relaxation as a phenomenon was largely absent from their lives. They were too intense and serious in doing the right thing with their leisure to have time to enjoy themselves. They played at leisure as they did at work, compulsively and rigidly.

We all work too hard at leisure, too hard at trying to convince ourselves and others that we are having a good time and that we are doing something constructive for ourselves and our families, building up social relationships in the community, and presumably the way to do it is by more folk dances, more hobbies, more recreation, more adult education, more and better books, more clubs, more bridge.

I cannot offer adequate or immediate substitutes for changing this trend of working at play so hard as to create a pervading anxiety. I can only offer the notion, "Why don't we take it easy, relax, and not formalize and constrict leisure pursuits to the rigid practices of the classroom or factory?" Permit people to seek their own level of leisure-need satisfaction, and if they do little in the formal sense like the beanie to greenie routine of dances, clubs, and so on, let us not coerce them by the weapons of suggestion or community ostracism. Those who chance to be shaped in the image which deviates from the norm of conformity should feel free to go about unfretted with anxiety because they dare to be different, to be individuals!

By insisting, consciously or unconsciously, upon the pattern of conformity in the development of leisure-time interests and pursuits, we are apt to make some glaring mistakes in judgment. Here is a case in point: Those of us who are married are told that it is desirable to develop outside interests such as hobbies, groups, and new skills as we grow older in order to replace the void created by the departure of children. Moreover, it is believed that after the children take leave, parents should

seek new activities and associations for their emotional well-being. I do not question this, at least in part. New activities may be good for *some*, I underline *some*, but not necessarily for all!

Several years ago in connection with a study on the relationships between families of different generations, the families of parents and their married children, I found that middle-aged parents who had their married children living nearby and had maintained harmonious relations during their raising period and through the courtship and marriage, experienced no basic change in their leisure patterns. What appeared significant to me was that even though these parents were engrossed in activities with their children and grandchildren (certainly in my viewpoint one of the highest forms of creative and productive leisure activities), they nevertheless were uneasy and anxious because well-meaning friends, trying to "help" them adjust, were insistent that they take up a new hobby or craft or join a club. Yet there is no need to set up uniform standards and cultural expectations for the pursuit of leisure, *i.e.*, a pattern of uniform response for everybody.¹⁴

LEISURE AND THE CHANGING FAMILY

Aside from the trend to insist upon similarity in the pursuit of leisure, the problem is further complicated by changing patterns and practices of our modern family and the roles of its members. Unless he is a farmer or otherwise self-employed (at home), the father leaves home for his place of employment for the large part of each day. His vacations and other free time are determined by the job. The wife who remains at home has assumed the chore of rearing the children and is also likely to be the social and business manager of her family. Children come fewer to present

¹⁴ Marvin B. Sussman, "Activity Patterns of Post-Parental Couples and Their Relationship to Family Continuity," *Marriage and Family Living*, Vol. 17 (November 1955), pp. 338-341.

Leisure: Bane or Blessing?

families and once they are of school age they become immersed in the activities of cliques and groups outside the home, and are gradually weaned from the family. Thus, each family member has outside interests, which can sometimes make of the home no more than a place in which to eat and sleep, hang one's hat, and to prepare himself for the battles of the next day. The family bulletin board, a current fad, exemplifies this latter point; it tells each family member who is doing what, when, and where. More than this, members are forced to seek social companionship outside the home, because family residences are small and as likely as not to be rented rather than owned, in the central city at least, thus making it at times necessary to live in quarters that are not conducive to harmonious family living.

The fragmentation of family life according to age and interest groups was made vivid to me very recently during the course of a small study on family life among church families in the Cleveland area. Many ministers, when asked about activities in their churches aimed at building integrated family relationships, replied that their biggest problem was getting the family together for a family night at church. The fragmentation of family life and the separation of family members from one another place additional strain on the organization and planning of leisure by the families themselves as well as community agencies.

SUMMARY

I have indicated that leisure is eclipsing work in its importance both as a problem and as the central life interest of all of us, particularly industrial workers. Obviously I have omitted the many millions who are not in industry and in unions and still have to work long hours, but even this group will be affected by the trend toward the shorter workweek and the focus on leisure. Until they reach this millenium or blessing, if it can be called that, their leisure needs will be somewhat different from the indus-

trial worker that I have described today.

I have also suggested that we play too hard at leisure, so hard, in fact, that we create neuroses for ourselves, our children, their leaders and teachers. This playing hard is part of a larger cultural pattern, the pattern of conformity; our suburbs have become "social factories" producing social relationships according to age, sex groupings, and social class. The creative and aesthetic components of leisure are lost to all but a few, the compulsive need to belong and be part of the mass has robbed us of our uniqueness, our individuality. Our leisure conformity syndrome is related to our compulsiveness about time, the right time to do this or that, meetings here and there, keeping on a schedule like punching a factory timeclock.

I have suggested also that the bane or blessing of our leisure is further related to structure and organization of the family and the new roles members are expected to perform. For the most part the urban family home is less a place for leisure-time pursuits in which all family members engage than a place to rest and prepare for outside activities.

NEW DIRECTIONS

The question arises—what can we do and plan to meet the problems arising out of this new leisure, arising to be sure out of a number of contradictory and complex forces that are not completely understood?

My major suggestion is that we particularize our methods and programs to meet specific needs of groups, communities, and families. I am opposed to *prima facie* action based upon the assumption that as our urban population grows we need bigger and better leisure-time services, the same kind we have today in every nook and cranny of our communities. I favor a conservative approach with the taking of action only after planned and systematic research and evaluation of every need for leisure-time services.

My second suggestion is more philo-

sophical than action-oriented—that we rethink our philosophy of use of leisure and leisure-time pursuits, that we become less conformist and more individualistic and if we need a new norm to govern this, it should be one which calls for and supports spontaneity, originality, and creativity in leisure pursuits. This is in sharp contrast to our mass-produced leisure product ground to meet the average taste today, which is more of a production of no thought than forethought and the castor oil of our civilization.

If what I have said about the central life interests of workers is valid—that their leisure interests have superseded work interests—then we have a direct challenge to see how their specific needs can be met. In Cleveland the Group Work Council recently completed a basic research project in the measurement of leisure-time needs. From their studies they established the criteria of community characteristics which affect need for community-sponsored leisure-time services and a method of measuring relative need among the forty-two social planning areas in Cuyahoga County.¹⁵ This report comes to grips with many of the questions I have raised, particularly what kind of leisure time service is required for what kind of family, age, occupational, sex, and racial group. Similar studies should be made in other urban areas.

Our families in the industrial worker's suburbs will have different needs for services than those who live in the central areas of our cities. For example, if the suburban worker is the "do-it-yourself" fan I think he is, then a community workshop equipped with adequate tools and supervision would meet a specific need; a man could come and go, to create or build when and if it pleased him. This service, if available, should not be rigidly organized; people can create their own organizations when necessary. Some

lumber companies are providing "do-it-yourself" clinics as a public service function (and I suspect also with interest in economic return). In this community of home owners counseling and advisory services, activities centering around and in the home may provide opportunities for creative expression and realization of latent abilities and the nurturing of skills and interests. In the central city residential areas of our industrial workers, leisure needs may be more intricately related to housing facilities and conditions, and agency and settlement programs are more likely geared to meet the leisure-time interests of workers under this set of life's conditions. It may be necessary that leisure programs of agencies in such areas concentrate not only on providing recreational outlets, group associations, and informal educational activities but also on programs aimed at alleviating harmful conditions under which leisure is pursued.

I would like to see created a council on leisure for metropolitan urban areas. This council would have representatives from every town, village, and city in the county and its function would be to assist persons, families, and groups in their pursuit of leisure-time interests. The organizational framework should be kept to a minimum and consultants and field workers should be employed. Careful research of needs should be made. This council should investigate the trend toward the introduction of traditional types of leisure programs in the growing suburbs.

This council could also foster the new approach and the new philosophy of leisure which I have already discussed; a philosophy which sponsors acceptability for the nonconformist and emphasizes leisure activities for the sheer joy of participation without the concomitant group pressures of the beanie-greenie pattern; a philosophy which demands a new intellectual emphasis upon the expression of individuality. We still need a group identity but not total conformity.

¹⁵ Virginia K. White, *Measuring Leisure-Time Needs* (multilith publication of the Group Work Council, Cleveland Welfare Federation, issued February 1955).

BY SUE SPENCER

Religion and Social Work

AT THE OUTSET, the major limitation of this discussion should be stated. It will not concern the question of what services should be carried on under religious auspices, or questions of professional standards, or the effect of church auspices on the content of program. It will deal chiefly with what seems to be a rather generally held belief on the part of the clergy, and other lay and professional church workers, that professional social workers are, by and large, a cold, heartless irreligious, if not frankly antireligious, group. (Catholic and Jewish social workers were at least tacitly excluded from such comments.) A striking instance occurred at the opening devotions for the Cleveland Conference of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. last fall when the conference chaplain compared the "cold," unfeeling social worker's effort to help a despondent person with the approach of the clergyman who was full of Christian love and understanding.

In the experience of the author clergymen are not generally aware of the amount of attention given in schools of social work to religion and the attitude of faculty in schools of social work toward religion as

an important factor in human life. They assume that religion is ignored, purposely excluded, or frankly depreciated in the teaching of the professional schools of social work. This is not surprising when we seem not to have much communication between the two fields (again thinking only of the Protestant faiths and social work) and when there has been in addition comparatively little written by representatives of social work about religion.

In order to answer some of the most pressing aspects of this problem, a questionnaire was recently circulated to a dozen leading social work educators and help was sought from several outstanding clergymen and members of theological school faculties. The questions fall readily into the following areas:

1. As reflected in our professional literature (the published opinions, beliefs, and knowledge of our professional leaders) do the goals, methods, and basic beliefs of social work appear to be religious, irreligious, or antireligious?¹

2. As seen in the curricula of our pro-

¹ Though not all representatives of organized religion would accept any single definition of religion, for our purposes I hope the following may be sufficient:

A religious person is one who holds some kind of belief or beliefs about the affirmative nature of the Universe (many people would interpret this to include "an awareness or conviction of a supreme being, arousing reverence, love, gratitude, the will to obey and serve, and the like") and man's duty to do something in addition to advancing his own ends; a belief or beliefs which furnish some degree of comfort and strength to the individual.

An irreligious person is one who is indifferent to sacred things, professes no religious beliefs.

An antireligious person is one who actively opposes religious beliefs and practice.

SUE SPENCER is director of the School of Social Work, University of Tennessee, Nashville. This paper grew out of her experience as chairman of the Commission on Professional Education to Meet the Churches' Needs, one of 20 national commissions established by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A., in preparation for its first national conference on the Churches and Social Welfare, held in Cleveland last November. The council is composed of approximately 60 communions, most of which are Protestant, and carries on a program of co-operative services and consultation to its member groups.

fessional schools of social work, are the objectives, methods, and content religious, irreligious, or antireligious in their effect upon the social work student?

3. Are there points at which the goals and methodology of the social worker and the clergyman or church worker are in real conflict? If such conflicts exist, are they serious or relatively unimportant? Should attempts be made to resolve such conflicts? To what extent are apparent conflicts really the result of: (a) too little communication or (b) the use of quite different terminology, or different frames of reference?

4. Representatives of organized religion have criticized social workers as being at best "barely literate" in religious matters and have made a strong plea for organized instruction in religion, comparable to that now given social work students in medicine and law. Is the criticism justified? If so, to what extent should the schools of social work attempt to make up for the inadequacies in basic knowledge of religion and just how could or should it be done? Should the nonsectarian schools be expected to go further than this?

5. If, as appears to be true, the Protestant churches are increasingly considering the establishment of denominational schools of social work to give both professional social work training and advanced training in religion, what are the reasons back of this and what are the implications for the social work field?

It is apparent by now that these questions have excluded certain considerations and a frame of reference has been set up. The questions listed above do not pertain to the Catholic schools of social work which have already made their own reconciliation of differences in philosophy and practice, between religion and social work. Hence, though our concern is with the basic beliefs and practices of the total profession of social work, in the interests of time no review will be made of the curricula of the Catholic schools or Catholic literature except as it may prove pertinent to the prob-

lem. Since the discontinuance of the Jewish School of Social Service twenty years ago, the orientation and help in the adaptation of social work practice to Jewish auspices has been carried on by the operating agencies, though there have been, from time to time, a series of organized programs jointly sponsored by national Jewish agencies and certain recognized schools of social work.

The concern, therefore, is with the nonsectarian schools of social work in which are enrolled annually about 3,200 full-time graduate students, the majority of whom are probably of Protestant religious background, and the remainder Catholic, Jewish, or not actually identified with any organized religion.

HETEROGENEITY OF THE PROFESSION

One of the difficulties which the public has in assessing any aspect of the profession of social work is the heterogeneity of the persons who make up the profession, and the even larger group whom the community identifies as engaged in social welfare; heterogeneous as to cultural and economic backgrounds, education, functions, status in the community, and auspices under which they work. Troublesome also is the fact that there is great heterogeneity in the organized religious faiths of this country. These are referred to, generally, as *communions*, some 60 of which hold membership in the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. and there are several other sizable Protestant bodies which are not included as not being sufficiently similar in religious beliefs or as not wishing to participate in this common effort. (It is interesting to note that in the group of social work educators responding to the questionnaire, there was great variety in religious beliefs and affiliations.)

It is obvious, therefore, that a part of our problem relates to the great variety of people engaged in social work, and the great range of difference in what individual clergymen recognize as satisfactory or "approvable" religious beliefs and prac-

Religion and Social Work

tices on the part of individual social workers. It seems probable, too, that because of the lack of clearly defined and recognized qualifications of social workers and the fact that social workers often function as parts of courts, hospitals, or schools, the relatively casual observer does not fully identify them as social workers who may be active in church attendance and other religious activities as readily as he would identify teachers, physicians, and attorneys. Hence, the clergyman who looks over his congregation and community, and wonders whether the social workers are with him or against him in his community concerns, may have little way of knowing how many social workers are at the moment engaged in religious worship and related activities. It seems fair to assume that the proportion of social workers participating regularly in religious worship (the most obvious basis for determining religious concern and identification) is at least as high as the proportion of the general population who attend church regularly. According to a recent article in *Time* magazine, this ranges from 37 percent on the Pacific Coast to 66 percent in the Southeastern region. One may well ask, however, whether more should be expected of persons in the professions serving people directly.

SOCIAL WORK'S BASIC BELIEFS

In addition to the question of the social worker's own identification with organized religion, there are several troublesome areas of professional practice of concern to the two professions which warrant careful study by both groups at the present time. The first of these is that social work's statement of basic beliefs, good though that statement is, falls short of what the clergy believe to be essential in a concept of man, his nature and his relation to the universe. The clergy, and organized religion generally, are concerned about a professional practice (social work) that deals with some of the most crucial and important facets of an individual's life and that does not affirm a

set of beliefs beyond those declared by the social work profession.

Leonard Mayo's statement of the profession's basic beliefs, in his presidential address at the Seventy-fifth National Conference of Social Work in 1948, is typical; similar statements, with only slight variations, appear in the published works of Benjamin Youngdahl, Charlotte Towle, Jane Hoey, Arlien Johnson, Kenneth Pray, and a score of other contemporary leaders, to say nothing of the earlier pioneers in social work:

Prominent in any expression of our philosophy and purpose must be a simple declaration of our articles of faith set forth in language of unmistakable clarity: our concern for people; our respect for the dignity, integrity, and rights of individuals; our abhorrence of injustice as one of the greatest foes of freedom; our responsibility to speak and act with respect to the causes as well as the results of social maladjustment; and our major concern, not only for prevention, restoration, and rehabilitation, but for helping to create relationships, homes, neighborhoods, and nations in which human beings may live out their lives and develop their full potentialities as free people. Let all this be a positive rather than negative approach, add the scientific bases of our sources of knowledge and methods, and we shall in due course develop a statement of philosophy around which we can rally, that scientists can respect, and the public can understand.²

With one addition, which is perhaps really inferred, Dr. Mayo's statement would find basic acceptance among social workers. The addition we would make would be: man's responsibility (as well as his right) to fulfill his maximum potentialities and to live responsibly as an individual, family member, and community participant. Perhaps it is the absence of this idea of the individual's responsibility in many of the

² Leonard W. Mayo, "Basic Issues in Social Work," 1948 *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949), p. 24.

daily pronouncements of practicing social workers and our emphasis on the rights of individuals that make the clergy uneasy about social work.

It should also be noted, in passing, that though the frame of reference of social work writers is primarily our basic belief in democracy and though we believe that this very democracy has its roots in the Judaeo-Christian religions, our stress on helping the individual use his own strengths and resources, without calling upon a higher power for help, gives the impression that social work practice operates without reference to this.

Ten years ago I received a rude shock when told by one of the leading ministers in the United States that Linton Swift's Code of Ethics for Social Workers simply confirmed his belief that the profession, at best, could only give a superficial and cold kind of help to people since its professional beliefs were based purely on humanistic concepts. Perhaps it is not surprising, therefore, as Protestant theologians and teachers have swung back to a reaffirmation of the general Biblical frame of thought, asserting that God is a God of action and salvation is more than just being religious, that social work's continuing identification with humanism and liberalism, and its silence on the question of man's relationship to God and God's concern about man, appear to the clergy and religious leaders as secular rather than religious in any sense of the term; hence they believe that social work can be considered irreligious.

CURRENT RELIGIOUS VIEWPOINT

In his chapter on "The Theological Renaissance," Daniel Day Williams outlines contemporary theological thought on three major points: the nature of God, the nature of man, and the doctrine of sin and salvation.³ The following excerpts summarize his major principles:

³ Daniel Day Williams, *What Present Day Theologians Are Thinking* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952), pp. 15-19.

The first article of Christian faith is that man has one and only one true object of worship. There is one holy God, creator of heaven and earth . . . Monotheism for the Christian means that anything else which is put in the place of our loyalty to God is an idol. The worship of national power, or racial prestige, or financial success, or cultural tradition is a violation of the one truth about our life, that all created things come from God. To commit life to the one true God is to refuse to have any other gods at all. Values there are in abundance, interests, plans, programs, loyalties to family and nation. But these are not gods. They do not save us. . . .

The second assertion in the Christian faith concerns its two-sided estimate of human nature. Man is made for God. Man can despoil his holy destiny. When the Christian asks who God is, he answers that we have God's revelation in a human life (the life of Jesus) . . . The positive estimate of man in Christianity stems from the belief that man in his freedom, in his creative power, in his personal worth, is the bearer of the high good at which the whole creation aims . . . Christianity always ultimately finds itself ranged on the side of a true humanism. Any creative expression of the essential spirit of man, any use of human powers to develop, extend and enhance the full powers of human life is a positive good for the Christian faith . . . The Christian demand is: Release the human powers. Heal human sickness. Build the decent society.

We cannot understand the depth of the Christian doctrine of sin if we give to it only a moral connotation . . . (The core of sin is our making ourselves the center of life, rather than accepting the holy God as the center.) Lack of trust, self-love, pride, these are three ways in which Christians have expressed the real meaning of sin . . .

The third Christian affirmation is that God makes possible a new life for sinful men. We are not doomed forever to walk on this knife edge of eternity with the threat of utter loss on one side and

Religion and Social Work

some tentative human good on the other. God in his own way has enabled man to walk with faith, with love, and with hope . . . When we know with our whole being that the door is open to the sinner to return to the way of love, there is a release from fear and from the self-destructive plunge into idolatry.

. . . What we may hope for today is that the needs of men to belong to one another in a human way may open the human spirit for a fresh hearing of the Gospel word as to where the source of that human community lies. At the intellectual level this means that theology must work in a constant conversation with the best secular thinking about the human problem.

Bishop Oxnam, addressing the Seventy-fifth National Conference of Social Work, put the matter very simply when he said:

I do not know what your faith may be. I respect it. I have my own. Nevertheless, I am convinced that as we move toward a new society there must come to mankind an understanding of the fact that we belong to one human family, that there is one Father of us all, that moral law is written into the nature of things, that this is our Father's world. I am convinced that all of this must be realized by those who would lead in social work. . . .⁴

Perhaps these statements will illustrate, as well as anything else, why religious leaders are increasingly troubled by social work which, because of its heterogeneity of practitioners and clients, does not assert a frankly religious base in its work with people. The fact that neo-orthodoxy, as the present trend is called, grew out of deep despair and a sense of futility with the humanistic approach to understanding life's meaning and man's place in it may be further reason for the attitude of the clergy toward contemporary social work.

⁴ G. Bromley Oxnam, "Goals for Social Work in a Contemporary Society," 1948 *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, op. cit. p. 94.

RELIANCE ON PSYCHOANALYSIS

A second area of concern and difficulty stems from social work's heavy reliance on psychoanalytic theory and the assumption on the part of many religionists that social workers have to a considerable extent (1) adopted the personal attitudes of Sigmund Freud about religion and (2) follow his teaching on the point of scrupulously abstaining from imposing the therapist's value-system on the person being treated. Especially helpful, in summarizing Freud's view is the following statement made by Dr. Walter Kluge, in a symposium on religion and psychotherapy, who says:

The therapist in turn must also be constantly aware of the limits in his field of endeavor. The analyst's function is to understand, and only to understand; he must abstain rigidly from influencing in any way the life philosophy of his patient, who unavoidably has transferred to him an abundant share of authority, and supervaluates his statements. Of course, during an effective analysis the patient resolves his neurotic pseudo-religious infantilisms; however, this means something entirely different from Freud's conviction that religion *per se* is infantile in character. But let us not forget that these negative appraisals appeared solely in papers expressing his highly personal opinions in reference to religion, but never in any scientific paper regarding analytical methods and doctrines. He himself repeatedly stressed the important distinction between his scientific work and his personal credo. Nevertheless, he was unable to prevent his convictions about religion from gaining general acceptance—again by supervaluation—by many of his followers as an essential part of his general teachings.⁵

It is undoubtedly true that social work practice went through a period of scrupulously avoiding influencing "the life philosophy" of individuals with whom it

⁵ Walter Kluge, "The Problem of Co-operation Between the Psychotherapist and the Spiritual Advisor," *Journal of Psychiatric Social Work*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Autumn 1948).

worked. As social work moved to define its function and clarify its difference from psychotherapy and other types of professional practice, increasing emphasis was given (and continues to be given) to values, goals, and beliefs. Of the many assertions by professional leaders, the following statement by Charlotte Towle represents such a generally held point of view that it could have been chosen almost at random:

Social work is one of society's instruments for enabling the social conscience to find expression. The very core of social work is social reform. The very core of social casework is the rehabilitation of the individual. The stigmatized reformer is one who attempts to impose himself on others, to recreate the individual in his own wishful image, or mold the world to his own liking without realistic reference to needs, capacities, and motivations of individuals and groups.

In casework it is realized that one cannot rehabilitate another. Motivation and remotivation come from within the individual and his family group. As the individual and his family seek help, however, it is the responsibility of the social worker to maintain an unswerving identification with the social conscience. This means that he will bring his professional knowledge and skill, the authority which he carries as representative of a social agency, to bear upon the community to create conditions favorable for the individual's development and to provide opportunities for his growth. It means, also, that he will use his powers to help the individual become socially competent. The social worker continuously will understand the individual, but he will not necessarily affirm his feelings, his thinking, or his acts. A basic acceptance of the social reform motive, that is, the rehabilitative goal in social casework, is occurring as social workers increasingly see it as meeting human need rather than fear it as a violation of man's right to self-determination.⁶

⁶ Charlotte Towle, "Helping the Client To Use His Capacities and Resources," 1948 *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, op. cit., p. 259.

Here again, the fact that the term "social" is used rather than "moral" or "religious" may confuse or alienate the clergy, who may not assume, as is generally done in social work, that the term "social" includes religious, moral, cultural, and related factors.

A FACTOR IN HUMAN LIFE

A third question relates to the value placed on religion as a factor in human life by social work practitioners. One immediately thinks of Miss Towle's little volume, *Common Human Needs*, in which under the subheading, "Spiritual Forces Are Important in Man's Development," she says:

But, literally, man does not live by bread alone. Demoralization and disintegration of the individual are prevented, in part, through opportunity to work and to take one's place in the community. But spiritual needs of the individual must also be recognized, understood and respected. They must be seen as distinct needs and they must also be seen in relation to other human needs. This entails provisions which safeguard church attendance, the use of church resources, and, in human-conduct problems, respect for the individual's religious convictions. Through the influence of religion the purpose of human life is better understood and a sense of ethical values achieved. With that understanding comes keener appreciation of the individual's relationship to his fellow man, his community, and his Nation. The need for religious influence is particularly acute in childhood and through adolescence, when the individual is likely to require definite guidance and supportive judgments to help him toward becoming an emotionally mature adult.⁷

It is true that few direct references, such as Miss Towle's, are made in social work literature to the importance of religion as a factor in human life, except in papers

⁷ Originally published 1945. Now available from National Association of Social Workers, New York, N. Y.

ER: Religion and Social Work

and volumes directed to this particular subject. Such an absence stems primarily from a belief in the separation of church and state and perhaps also from the haunting shadow of a kind of prostitution of religion which requires the advocacy of a given religious faith in return for economic or personal help. The recent volume, *New Directions in Social Work*, for example, makes no direct reference to this matter but the following is chosen from several comments which are equally pertinent. Harry L. Lurie describes "a new frontier":

Assuming that reactionary politics and retrogressive economic conditions will not materialize—which may or may not be the case—there is a new frontier for social change in many areas of social and personal relationships. It is inherent in our unsolved international relations, in our own race and group relations and problems of discrimination, in the strains and conflicts of family life, in the unsolved problems of emotional disturbance, mental disease, and unhappy personal lives, and in the prevalent but not necessarily desirable concepts of the responsibility of the individual to the group or to society. The ways in which these problems involve our culture and social institutions have not been identified. Even should we be able to identify the nature of these problems of human relationships there are probably not available the clear-cut solutions that were designed for dealing with unemployment and income deficiencies. Except for problems of race relations and discrimination, little in the way of basic programs has been formulated and advanced by social workers.⁸

Implied, at least, in Mr. Lurie's description of social work's responsibility is a recognition that economic security, an area in which social work has pioneered, is not enough.

⁸ Harry L. Lurie, "The Responsibilities of a Socially Oriented Profession," *New Directions in Social Work*, Cora Kasius, ed., (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), p. 44.

STUDENTS AND THEIR EDUCATION

Basic to our consideration of these questions is a fourth one: What kinds of people are entering the profession of social work and what are the schools of social work offering in the way of professional preparation? It is clear that in the nonsectarian (Secular) schools of social work there is great range in the religious beliefs and practices of the students. There is evidence that they are fairly typical of the cultural backgrounds of the sections of the country from which they come, though undoubtedly this is affected, to some extent, by the personal biases and activities of a school's best-known faculty members as well as many factors identified with the school's auspices, course offerings, history, and alumni. Many students enter schools of social work with a moderate or fairly strong impulse to serve people and society. They are thought to be predominantly middle class in background, though there are enough upper-class and lower-class students, culturally speaking, to make their presence felt.

Probably social work students are no less religious, nor more so, than the average run of the population. There is, however, an increased interest in religion in this country, and it is recognizable on many college campuses. Certainly there are many observable instances of mature religious beliefs and practices on the part of social work students; but there are also students whose religion is of an infantile or immature character and for whom the introduction of new knowledge in the graduate social work curriculum may be difficult to assimilate with their current religious beliefs. Social work faculty are usually alert to such situations and the inclusion of one or more lectures on religion and human personality as an integral part of the courses in human growth and personality demonstrates the school's recognition of its importance. The faculty advising systems which prevail in schools of social work give opportunity for the faculty representative who is alert to the student's learning prob-

lems to give such help as he is competent to give and to refer the student to a religious counselor, just as one would refer students for medical or legal assistance. Again, there is great range in the knowledge and skill of social work faculties in counseling on religious matters, but one may be sure that a basic part of the social work faculty member's competence is the ability to recognize when a problem is serious, resources for dealing with it, and how to refer him for help.

Further, the social work students, in the great majority of instances, are attending schools that are a part of a sizable college or university campus. They have access to all the religious programs provided for college students by organized religion. In such denominational student centers, social work students have the religious counseling by persons skilled in helping college students with religious problems. They also participate in a wide variety of activities with students from other professional disciplines and subject areas and from other cultural backgrounds.

As to what is taught in schools of social work, the curriculum falls roughly into three major classifications, with professional philosophy and values stressed throughout: human growth and behavior, social welfare organization, and social work practice. Theory and practice courses are integrated and constant effort is made to have the theory courses "work inside the students" (to borrow a phrase from a Dutch student) just as the practice courses do—in other words, to make the courses that are essentially knowledge rather than skill courses have vitality and meaning for the students. Religion as a factor in human life and the church as an important social (community) institution are included as regular parts of both knowledge and skill courses, though they are perhaps not always given as much attention or handled as well as one might wish.

At the University of Tennessee, we have experimented with a number of ways of presenting this at both first- and second-year levels, using our own faculty, clergymen, an internationally known cultural anthropologist, student analyses of typical religious problems encountered by social workers, or some combination of these. It must be remembered that with the wide range of religious beliefs and sects represented in the typical social work student body, great care must be taken to respect these beliefs and not to seem to cast doubt or to disparage any particular faith or even the lack of it. Religious teaching is believed to be the responsibility of the church and not a secular school of social work.

Can we answer, now, some of the original questions we set ourselves? It seems clear that there is nothing in our basic professional literature which is antireligious, but rather that our basic professional philosophy coincides with the principal teachings of the Judaeo-Christian faiths insofar as man's attitude toward man is concerned and the responsibility of all men to help each other live fruitfully and responsibly together. If social work omits specific reference to man's relationship to God, this does not constitute a denial of the individual's right to affirm this nor does it deny the value in human well being of such affirmation.

Perhaps more time and attention *should* be given in the professional curriculum to religion as a factor in human life, in social organization, and in social work practice. The real test on this question may well be whether leading professional social workers and the community leaders who participate in developing and administering our social services feel this is a real lack in our present professional education, and, if so, whether the professional schools of social work constitute the place where such instruction can best be given.

BY GERTRUDE BINDER

Publicize, Interpret or Relate?

MAKING OURSELVES BETTER liked and better understood by more and more people is an effort that engages the attention of practically every one of us in one way or another. Social work, social agencies, government departments, as well as industry and business enterprises, are concerned with their relationship with persons outside their own organization, and, as a matter of fact, those within, because employees are a part of the much-courted public. We have become very conscious of the fact that almost anything we do is likely to win or lose friends for us and there is evidence that the realization has brought with it confusion.

CONFUSING TERMS

The confusion, which seems to stem from the difficulty of deciding which of many possible approaches we should take when we wish to begin an organized effort to win public acceptance, is compounded by the ambiguity of public relations language. Terms like press agency, advertising, and propaganda are examples. To many of us they have negative connotations and call to mind ballyhoo, misrepresentation, and the deliberate spreading of falsehoods for political purposes. The activities they originally described, however, contributed something to the development of public relations practice, and they are based on realities that social workers need to keep in

mind as we try to make ourselves better known and understood.

A *press agent*, for instance, creates publicity-worthy events to attract attention to some person or thing. He knows that no one is likely to get into the news unless he does something that is sufficiently interesting to be talked about. We seem to assume, at times, that merely because social agencies exist and have good intentions, they should be given space in newspapers and on other communications media.

Advertising is the purchase of space or time. Advertisers realize that they must pay for the privilege if they wish to get before the public exactly what they want said about their activities or their product in the way they want it said. If they are not willing to pay, then they can expect to be given space only to the extent that what they have to tell serves the purposes of those they are asking to tell it. In other words, if we expect newspapers to print what we want said without regard for journalistic standards, then we should send our releases to advertising managers rather than to news editors. The advertising department is responsible for using what is paid for as it is sent in; the editor is responsible for seeing that only genuine news gets into the news column.

Propaganda is the organized, systematic spreading of a doctrine and originally it was used in connection with the propagation of religious faith. Those who propagandized had conviction about the doctrines they were disseminating. The concept is positive and aggressive rather than passive and defensive. One would sometimes suspect that we are not propagandists for some of our welfare programs as, for instance, aid to needy children, because we ourselves are not convinced.

GERTRUDE BINDER holds the position of representative, Division for the Blind, California State Department of Social Welfare. A former newspaper reporter and a graduate social worker, she is a member of the Commission on Interpretation of the National Association of Social Workers, where the idea for this article originated.

TERMS USED BY SOCIAL WORKERS

The greatest confusion of all, however, seems to surround those terms that are currently popular in social work, namely, *publicity*, *interpretation*, and *public relations*. If someone says that a certain executive is a good public relations man, it is impossible without firsthand information to know whether this means that he makes good speeches, is known to many people and generally liked as a person, or that he heads an organization that gets much favorable notice in the papers, time on radio and television, and favorable response to beautifully printed material and attention-compelling billboards.

Sometimes we hear it said that public relations is everybody's business. It is in the interest of public relations that workers should be punctual, receptionists treat those who come to the reception desk with courtesy, caseworkers behave with consideration and respect toward their clients, typists send out neatly typed letters, and supervisors give consideration to the ideas and aspirations of their subordinates. There is irony in this. It implies that if the public were not watching, employees would be entirely free to come to work late, be discourteous to clients, send out untidy-looking letters, and be generally inefficient.

When the National Association of Social Workers was organized last summer, various committees and commissions were set up through which the membership could participate and the work of the association be carried forward. There was enough to do, so there was no need for duplication. However, among the committees there was one on public relations and among the commissions there was one on interpretation. At first glance there seemed to be a fairly clear distinction between the two, since the committees have assignments related to the organization and administration of the association, and the commission was to outline a program of action "directed toward the development of increased public

understanding of the place and function of the professional social worker and social work programs in our society." When the Committee on Public Relations and the Commission on Interpretation began to meet, however, and got their programs under way, the distinction was hard to maintain.

It is my thesis that if we could agree on what it is we are talking about, then we could determine the jobs to be done and who should do them. I should like to attempt a beginning in this direction by examining what the term *public relations* means to some of those who call themselves public relations practitioners.

WHAT IS PUBLIC RELATIONS?

In 1947, Glenn and Denny Griswold, editors of *Public Relations News*, solicited definitions of public relations from their subscribers. They got two thousand suggestions and out of them distilled the following:

"Public relations is the management function which evaluates public attitudes, identifies the policies and procedures of an individual or an organization with the public interest, and executes a program of action to earn public understanding and acceptance."¹

Webster's New International Dictionary gives a definition formulated by the Public Relations Society of America:

1. The activities of an industry, union, corporation, profession, government or other organization, in building and maintaining sound and productive relations with special publics, such as customers, employees, or stockholders and with the public at large, so as to adapt itself to its environment and interpret itself to society.

2. The state of such activities or the degree of their success, in furthering pub-

¹ Denny Griswold, *Public Relations Comes of Age* (Boston: Boston University School of Public Relations, 1947), p. 3.

Publicize, Interpret or Relate?

lic understanding of an organization's economic and social adjustment, as good or poor *public relations*.

3. The art of organizing and developing these activities; as university courses in *public relations*; *public relations* requires technical skill and various techniques. Hence, public relations officer, director, counsel, or consultant.

Public relations literature generally emphasizes a two-way process. The Griswold definition speaks of identifying "the policies and procedures of an individual or an organization with the public interest." According to Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center,² many practitioners hold that the big job of the public relations counselor is to interpret the public interest to his employer. Since the public is made up of many groups, some of whose interests conflict, the objective of a public relations program should be to identify the mutual interests of the sponsoring group and others, then develop a plan for serving them.

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

Public relations, as conceived of in these definitions and discussions, is pervasive; there is a public relations aspect to practically every policy decision and action of an agency or organization. It is probably this that is responsible for such canards as "A job well-done is the best possible public relations" and "Public relations is everybody's business." It is probably this also that misleads some persons with job titles like public relations counselor or director into attempting to take over administrative responsibilities. Publicity is not a substitute for competence or a cover-up for the lack of it, but a job well done is not, *ipso facto*, a job well known. It is apparent, though, that public relations

and administration have something in common.

Turning to the literature of administration, we find Avery Leiserson saying:

The ultimate goal of the developing profession of administration is probably administration by an expert, but a socially adequate standard of expertness will then include a capacity or facility for judgment in which his policy and decisions are guided by the test of optimum satisfaction on the part of the groups affected by his administrative acts.³

A public relations expert could add very little to that.

In social work itself, certainly, sensitivity to others and the effect of our actions on them is a basic part of our equipment. No matter how we define social work and no matter what our field of specialization, the quality of our relations with other people is crucial to the performance of our job. Kenneth Pray said:

The core of these processes, methods, and skills of generic social work practice is obviously in the disciplined use of one's self in direct relation with people, both individually and in groups. All else is secondary and incidental and assumes significance only as it eventuates in the more effectual performance of the worker in that direct relationship.⁴

If this is the nature of our professional equipment, then bringing in special public relations counselors to help us do the job is carrying coals to Newcastle.

The conclusion one comes to from all this is that in an industry, business, or government, and particularly in a social agency, the responsibility for public relations rests in top management.

³ Avery Leiserson, *Administrative Regulation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942).

⁴ Kenneth L. M. Pray, "When Is Community Organization Social Work Practice?" in 1947 *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1948), p. 198.

² Scott M. Cutlip and Allen H. Center, *Effective Public Relations* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952), p. 9.

Dimock and Dimock maintain that "in the broadest sense, public relations is almost synonymous with the administrative process itself because its purpose is to satisfy all parties' interests—public, employees, and management included."⁵ They regard public relations as the staff activity a chief administrator can least afford to relinquish to someone else.

An administrator can make use of technical assistance from experts engaging in analyzing public sentiment; he can employ specialists to implement a policy of keeping the public informed. But to delegate to a subordinate everything that affects the public would amount to abdication. Social work activity, in particular, has inherent in it the conscious building of constructive relationships and we become involved in a contradiction when we talk of public relations as something to be added from without.

INTERPRETATION AND PUBLICITY

Interpretation and *publicity* which we at times confuse with public relations are tools that may be used to further public relations ends. If we are agreed this far on the nature of over-all public relations responsibility, then we are free to give attention to what the tools are and how and when they should be used.

Interpretation as a separate function is not often mentioned in public relations literature. The connotation of the word is not positive, particularly when used by a profession based on relationship with others and among people. It calls to mind a foreign group whose language must be translated before it can be understood, and suggests no rapport whatsoever with the audience to which it is directed. Actually, the activity designated as interpretation is usually equivalent to publicity which Cutlip and Center define as:

The dissemination of information, making matters public from the point of view of one who wishes to inform others. Systematic distribution of information about an institution or an individual.⁶

This is a tangible activity in which specific, specialized skills are employed. It involves the use of mass communications media such as press, radio, television, and motion pictures; the production and distribution of printed material; public speaking; direct mailings to special groups; and various other methods of spreading information. It may be directed to the public at large or to segments of the public with special interests.

Programs of publicity are based on the premise that there is information about an organization or profession that some particular group or all of the public would be interested in knowing, and that, if known, would add to the prestige of the organization. The job consists of determining what the information is that is wanted and how and when to get it to those who want it. Whether the effort is directed to the public in general or to specific groups, or both, depends on the objective.

Public relations is a two-way phenomenon. It involves bringing information from the public to the organization or groups concerned and giving it consideration in program and policy development as well as communicating to the public. Publicity is concerned with conveying accurate information to the public. It is two-way only in the sense that its practitioners need to know how and to what extent the public they wish to reach is misinformed or lacking in information about the organization to be publicized.

Planning and executing programs of publicity for social agencies is a tremendous responsibility. It includes the establishment of priorities in groups to be reached, selection of channels for reaching the public, development of technical skills, and establishment of good relationships with

⁵ Marshall Edward Dimock and Gladys Ogden Dimock, *Public Administration* (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1953), pp. 403-405.

⁶ Cutlip and Center, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

Publicize, Interpret or Relate?

the communications industries. It involves, also, complete and thorough understanding of professional concepts and agency policies so they can be brought to the public in understandable but undistorted language. There is much that we need to know and much that could be added to what has been written and said about social work publicity. If those of us who are interested in getting better understanding of our profession and of welfare programs can agree that over-all public relations responsibility belongs to executives and boards of directors, we will be free to concentrate on the production of actual, effective programs of publicity.

CONCLUSION

Building good public relations is a responsibility of administration and an integral

part of social work itself. The way to strengthen the public relations of agencies and organizations is to strengthen in administrators awareness that responsibility to the public and to society is a part of their job. This responsibility includes reporting to and informing all those affected by the agency's actions.

Interpretation is an unfortunate word which seems to have entered social work language because of false modesty and a reluctance on the part of social workers to say that they wished people to know what they were doing. Publicity is a more honest and understandable word. We should recognize that we want publicity and intensify our efforts to publicize as honestly, effectively, and widely as possible, our profession and our agencies, what we stand for, and what we are trying to do.

BY JUDGE NATHAN J. KAUFMAN

A Juvenile Court Helps Parents

IN WAYNE COUNTY Juvenile Court, not unlike many similar courts in other metropolitan settings, we found ourselves set up to take care of juveniles and fully absorbed in all kinds of work and services for the young people who were brought into court. But completely lacking were legal provisions, organization, personnel, and other means to assist the parents of these children, who were often in more serious need of assistance than their youngsters. We felt, as most juvenile court judges and workers must feel, that we were not touching the real roots of the juvenile's problems—the parents. We could, for instance, place a child in a boarding home or institution if such a placement was advisable, but during the child's absence from home, we were unable to effect desired changes in the parents' personalities so that they would be prepared for the rehabilitated child or could manage other children in the family in a more mature and intelligent manner.

To compensate at least partly for this inadequacy in our social and judiciary

NATHAN J. KAUFMAN is judge of probate in charge of the Juvenile Court of Wayne County, Detroit, Michigan. Under his initiative and with the co-operation of his staff (Dr. John Franklin, Robert Mathieson, Stanley Stefan, director of the Parents' Program) and of the members of the Psychology Club (Virginia Traphagan and George Hallock), the public service described in this paper was developed.

The significance of this paper derives from a point of view still far too little accepted in the courts. Because the trend to treat rather than punish young offenders has not even yet become the rule, and the approach which regards parents as people to be helped rather than punished is still all too rare, we welcome this contribution.

organization, we developed a "school for parents," to offer them in a small way some of the social, educational, and clinical assistance that was available to their children.

A committee composed of educators, court workers, and the director of the local clinic for child study first studied similar enterprises in other cities, and came forward with a "Parents' Program" and selected a director (a psychologist and former college instructor) who was largely responsible for the formulation of the educational-therapeutic methods. The results of our program have been so satisfactory, primarily in terms of the response and co-operation of the parents, that I feel obliged to share with other workers how we approached this difficult social problem. The program has been in operation since April 1955.

PARENTS' PROGRAM

The primary aim of the Parents' Program is, through therapeutic-like work with the parents, to bring about "changes" in their personalities and particularly to modify their habits and feelings, to increase their self-esteem and self-reliance as parents and to ameliorate undesirable feelings. Such a goal was proposed to be achieved through group work, acceptance, a feeling of prestige gained by parents through close social contact with the judge and other professional workers, and the opportunity to express themselves and to learn about the feelings and attitudes of other parents. We recognized this as a bold goal and expectation.

Second, we aimed to bring about new

Social Work

Juvenile Court Helps Parents

insights, skills, and "know-how" in the parents through educational means—selected films, realistic instruction, questions and answers, individual counseling, and recommendations for reading materials and the distribution of pamphlets. The program was designed to fit their ways, interests, and expectations.

The "students" were encouraged to attend by the probation officers and workers of the court, and in addition, received a personal, written invitation from the judge. The parents we knew fell into one or more overlapping categories of: mentally subnormal, uneducated, inadequate, emotionally disturbed, socially handicapped people. About 70 percent of the parents encouraged by the court did attend, with about 60 percent continuing at subsequent sessions; the average attendance at each session was about seventy-five parents. In addition, other parents (about 20-30 percent of the group) were attracted to the program by publicity.

Each session, held every second Wednesday, was divided into two one-hour intervals, with a ten-minute coffee break and refreshments prepared and served by the members of a local ladies' service organization. The first hour consisted of a mental hygiene film, instruction on a related educational, mental hygiene, or psychological topic, then open discussion. The topics were largely confined to the field of children's upbringing with stress on adolescent problems and habit training, and the easing of marital and family difficulties. After coffee, parents broke up into groups of five for group discussion and individual counseling. A counselor (social worker, psychologist, visiting teacher, or other professional) was present at each table to stimulate and assist the discussion. For special problems or questions and for confidential advice, the group leader referred the parent to an advisor for individual counseling.

Twelve to fifteen counselors, four or five advisors (well-experienced psychologists,

social workers, and other professionals), one speaker, and four to five hostesses who prepared and served the refreshments, were employed at each session.

From the very first, parents were treated as "adequate citizens" who were expected to be motivated by personal pride, love and interest in their children, and a desire to help themselves. They were encouraged to feel as if they were attending a club meeting or a family affair through an atmosphere of social spontaneity, a friendly atmosphere, and freedom to move around, exchange ideas, and participate freely. The professional workers mingled with the parents as if they were "other parents."

WHAT MADE THE PROGRAM A SUCCESS

The success of the program in helping parents can be attributed to elaborate planning, supervision of detail, and insistence on the disciplined conduct of the sessions. Speaking in front of the parents was restricted to the welcome by the judge of the court, a 30-minute talk by the instructor, and answers to questions by the parents. Nothing was permitted to interfere with the group work which lasted at least one hour.

Selection of instructors. Special efforts were made to select capable, interesting, and inspiring instructors, individuals who not only had academic prestige and position, but combined this with an ability to reach and influence people. In practice, we tried to select instructors who would be not only "down to earth" speakers and practical educators but also known authorities on a particular subject. Instructors were asked to include scientific data with inspirational material, to use appropriate examples and jokes, and to make the parents' problems appear as "ours" and not "yours."

The counselors. More than any of the other program's workers, the counselors were expected to initiate hoped for changes in the personalities of the parents. It was

they who greeted individual parents as they entered the meeting room, engaged them in conversation, and finally assimilated themselves into the small groups of parents who came together at each table. During the second hour, counselors continued with their groups in a more serious and therapeutic discussion. They "listened," brought other parents into the conversation, stimulated free expression, and in general provided as much opportunity for spontaneous action of the parents as possible. They helped parents reach their own conclusions and talked at length only when supporting or encouraging them.

Advisors. Parents who did not wish to discuss their children or husbands or wives in the group, or who requested specialized assistance, were directed to an advisor who worked on an individual basis.

REACTIONS OF PARENTS

In the planning stage of the Parents' Program, we visualized our "students" as passive, ineffectual, and to some extent unfriendly people who were not likely to give themselves to the program, but who were expected to "sweat it out" and give up easily despite our efforts. On the contrary, most of the parents attending were warm, spontaneous, eagerly co-operative, and anxious to please. Those who attended one or two sessions were usually won over to the entire program and attended other sessions without further encouragement or invitation.

Many parents expressed their gratitude for the opportunities offered them and developed a feeling of responsibility for the program. Some offered to share expense, participate in future planning, and advanced many ideas for improvement. They were lavish in their grateful acknowledgment through letters, telephone calls, and conversation.

Through intimate discussions and numerous contacts with all kinds of people, the parents learned a variety of ways (not

necessarily approved by educators, but realistic and efficient) of coping with specific problems. Most of them were encouraged to find that their intimate difficulties were quite common to other parents. Parents with similar problems and tasks tried, with the help of a counselor, to formulate a more uniform solution to whatever appeared to be a community problem. Many minor problems caused by lack of knowledge of "how, what, where, when, and why" were solved. An attempt was made to provide the parents with useful patterns and methods for handling and solving their problems. A special emphasis was given to all educational and mental hygiene resources.

They learned that they were not abandoned by society, that other parents had similar problems, and that professional workers were not "cold" intellectuals and officials but sympathetic people and parents like themselves. But interestingly enough, most of the inspiration for helping themselves and renewed interest in trying again came to the parents from an in-group feeling rather than from official verbal support and encouragement. It was quite apparent during the sessions that the parents learned almost as much from other parents as from the program's instructors and counselors.

NEW INSIGHTS FOR STAFF

We expected most of the parents to be helpless, rigid, lacking in inner resources, and blocked in the development of new ways of handling their problems. On the contrary, most of them revealed themselves as quite active, open-minded, interested in socio-educational subjects, and very willing and anxious to help themselves. Most of them were so burdened with material, economic, and other difficulties, however, and so dependent and fearful that they rarely tried to use their own inner resources to solve or ameliorate their difficulties.

The intimate, unofficial, and homelike contact of our probation officers, social

Social Work

MAN: *Juvenile Court Helps Parents*

workers, psychologists, and teachers with the parents convinced many of them that these "inadequate people" were not at all as "inadequate" or "bad" as they believed. Even our most pessimistic workers seemed to derive from their contacts with the parents more respect for their abilities, more zest for their work, and a more hopeful attitude toward public service in general. One social worker in a private agency remarked that "The Parents' Program was the first genuine attempt in Detroit to do something for parents."

CONCLUSION

To what extent our program has assisted the parents in a basic and permanent change in their personalities is not known and cannot be easily known. We wish to believe, and have many reasons to believe, that our efforts assisted our "students" in a

better handling of their varied problems.

Nor is it yet possible to know how our work with problem parents correlates with a decrease of juvenile delinquency—such a study would be premature for some time to come. The Parents' Program is still in an experimental stage—it is constantly changing its organization, methods, and approach, and fitting itself to new demands and situations.

We have found that a juvenile court, with the backing of a loyal staff and the use of initiative in drawing on its community resources *can help parents*. We found that parents can be (1) won over, (2) taught better ways of handling their problems, (3) inspired to release their own psychic resources for improvement of their situation, (4) initiated in the development of new attitudes, feelings, and habits, and in general started on the way to gradual self-improvement.

BY SAUL SCHEIDLINGER, Ph.D.

Social Group Work and Group Psychotherapy

THE PRACTICE OF social group work has usually been identified with settlement houses, community centers, or youth organizations. In recent years, however, there has been a growing movement to utilize group workers in new and different settings. Thus, group work services have been sought out by general and psychiatric hospitals, by camps and institutions for the physically handicapped, as well as by a variety of residential treatment centers.

In the wake of this trend came some inevitable repercussions. Some people in the field objected to the diversion of the small number of trained workers away from the traditional group work agencies in the community. They feared that this might lower the quality of general group work practice and widen even further the numerical gap between the professionally trained and the untrained group work practitioners. There were others who viewed this new development with enthusiasm, not infrequently even considering it as an instance of group workers now doing group psychotherapy. The American Association of Group Workers had appointed a special committee which reported on the "Similarities and Differences Between Group Work and Group Therapy."¹ This committee tried to distinguish among what it called general group work, "psychiatric or therapeutic group work," and group therapy. While there was ambivalence at first about this

latter term, it was subsequently concluded that *group therapy* could be used "... in relation to one part of the group worker's function in psychiatric settings. Group therapy simply means working toward improvement or cure of a patient's recognized sickness (not necessarily fully diagnosed) by using the group medium."

At about the same time (October 1951) another committee from the American Association of Psychiatric Social Workers addressed itself to the problem of the emerging practice of psychiatric group work. It stressed the need for integrating its training programs in schools of social work with those for psychiatric social case-work. The faculty members responsible for teaching psychiatric group work were to be experienced workers who could qualify for membership in the American Association of Psychiatric Social Workers.

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

As might be expected, these developments evoked much concern in the profession. There was not only the matter of confusion in terminology and methods, but also some regrettable status conflicts among practitioners as to who was doing group psychotherapy, psychiatric group work, or what not, and why! Some clarification of this was undertaken in a paper² which com-

SAUL SCHEIDLINGER is group therapy consultant in the Division of Family Services of the Community Service Society of New York. This article is based on a paper given at the Massachusetts Conference of Social Work in Boston, December 1955.

¹ Gisela Konopka, "Similarities and Differences Between Group Work and Group Therapy," in *Selected Papers in Group Work and Community Organization* (Raleigh, N. C.: Health Publications, 1951).

² Saul Scheidlinger, "The Concepts of Social Group Work and of Group Psychotherapy," *Social Casework*, Vol. 34, No. 7 (July 1953), p. 292.

Group Work and Group Psychotherapy

pared the historical backgrounds and conceptual frameworks of social group work and group psychotherapy. Despite their variant origins both fields represent professionally guided ways of harnessing group psychological forces for helping people in groups. While these fundamental group forces are probably the same in all face-to-face groups, there are vital differences in the aims and levels of these two approaches. Group psychotherapy's focus on curing or alleviating diagnosed pathology in individuals through the conscious application of specific techniques in especially planned and balanced groups was contrasted with the stated aims of social group work. The latter's emphasis on promoting individual personality growth together with social development of the group as an entity was noted. The careful selection of individual patients on the basis of diagnostic evaluations and treatment plans in group therapy was compared with the natural or planned groups in typical group work agencies where the membership is drawn from the general community. A major difference was seen also in group work's goal of sponsoring democratic attitudes and behavior patterns and development of the group as a self-determining unit. There were, in addition, the educational aspects of the group worker's job: teaching skills, leading programs, mediating, advising—aspects largely absent in psychotherapy.

Thus, major lines of conceptual difference emerge by such guideposts as the specific aims of a given practitioner for each group member and particular group, the level of group interaction, and the techniques used by the leader. At the same time the earlier commonly held idea that group work is for the normal, group therapy for the disturbed becomes untenable, for social group work can be applied with considerable benefit to the sickest of patients. In this connection it is useful to differentiate between *therapeutic effects* accruing from a variety of mental hygiene-based group measures, and *therapy* in the

sense of a psychological process where specific techniques are applied by trained practitioners to deal with recognized areas of pathology.

A perusal of group work writings during the last few years reveals a gratifying lessening of the earlier-noted confusion in terminology. While there are still some people who are apt to use the terms group work interchangeably with group therapy, this occurs quite infrequently. Furthermore, in line with the movement toward stressing the generic aspects in various fields of social work, the specialization of "psychiatric or clinical group work" has given way to the designation of group work in psychiatric or clinical settings.

Why is it so difficult to delineate more clearly the differences and similarities between social group work and group psychotherapy? One obvious reason lies in the inability at the present stage of our knowledge to depict precisely what transpires externally and intrapsychically in individuals in groups varying from group education to the deepest forms of group analysis. There is also the fact that despite rather obvious differences in aims and levels of practice, certain leadership techniques—i.e., more or less direct methods of controlling surface behavior—can be applied with equal effectiveness in group work and group therapy alike. Surely, an important factor resides within the field of social group work which is usually defined in such general terms that it is difficult to spell out how it differs from other ways of working with people in groups. Only such a circumstance permitted Wilson and Ryland, for instance, to draw the following rather questionable conclusion: ". . . the psychiatrist . . . equipped to deal with unconscious feelings and motivations, uses the *group work method* as a tool in psychotherapy."³ Hollis and Taylor probably

³ Gertrude Wilson and Gladys Ryland, *Social Group Work Practice* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949), p. 63.

expressed a similar concern when they said, "... there seems to be a need for greater clarification of the distinction between group work as a therapeutic device closely related in objectives and criteria to casework, group work as a method of assisting people to work together and as such closely allied to community organization and administration, and group work as a process having some separate and wider objectives and techniques of its own."⁴ It is quite possible that the time is here for a committee of outstanding teachers and practitioners to formulate a "Scope and Methods of Social Group Work" paralleling a similar task that was accomplished admirably in the field of family casework.⁵ Such a project would be especially timely in view of the growing interest in utilizing group processes within the social work profession, in supervision, administration, and in "family life education."⁶ There are also fields outside social work such as adult education, public health, physical rehabilitation, and even industry that are most eager to adopt group procedures for their own purposes. In these spheres as well, group work could make a valuable contribution.

There is a growing body of literature dealing with the practice of social group work in a variety of therapeutic settings. According to the published reports it appears that as group workers have moved into pediatric wards, into hospitals and rehabilitation centers, and into institutions for neglected and delinquent children the adjustment pangs are at a minimum. However, such a transition is frequently more complicated when it comes to treatment centers for emotionally disturbed individuals under psychiatric direction. It is

in psychiatric settings specifically where most questions arise regarding the role of the group worker and that of other, already established personnel such as psychiatric social workers, occupational therapists, or nurses. Furthermore, certain group workers refer not infrequently to their direct work with groups of institutionalized clients as group therapy and thereby invite considerable misunderstanding.

SOME ACTUAL EXPERIENCES

In line with this, there was organized in March 1955, at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, a round table on "Social Group Work in Psychiatric Residential Settings" to consider some actual experiences in this field. The participants, aside from a psychiatrist who served as discussant, were all experienced social group workers who administered and supervised effective group work programs. They reported on the practice of group work at a state receiving mental hospital, a private mental hospital for adolescents and adults, and a treatment center for emotionally disturbed children. While the proceedings of this meeting will be published elsewhere in full,⁷ a brief preliminary report may be of interest here on major trends in each institution.

The group work-recreation program at the state receiving hospital is conducted under the auspices of a broad Social Service Department which comprises, in addition to social group workers, both caseworkers and recreation therapists. Prior to the formation of the unified Social Service Department, group work was directed for over six years by what was termed the "Group Work Therapy Department." This latter unit, including the term "therapy," was abandoned in favor of the combined Social Group Work and Recreation Program which offers three major kinds of group experiences to patients: (1) recreational

⁴ Ernest V. Hollis and Alice L. Taylor, *Social Work Education in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), p. 146.

⁵ *Scope and Methods of the Family Service Agency* (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1953).

⁶ *Family Service Highlights*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (February 1953).

⁷ *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. To be published.

Group Work and Group Psychotherapy

activities for the living-in group, the ward; (2) open recreation or mass programs available to the total hospital population; (3) small, formed groups of patients of the discussion and activity types.

At the private, community-sponsored mental hospital, the Group Activities Department includes social group workers (trained and volunteer) as well as recreation leaders. In contrast to the public hospital mentioned above, there is a separate social casework department. The major group activities occur in small friendship and special interest groups for those patients granted the freedom of the hospital grounds. Those on the closed wards have discussion or activity programs on the premises. All the living-in groups have self-governing elective committees which, aided by the group worker, make plans for dealing with the various problems of ward life. As was the case in the public hospital, there are also regular evening mass activities under the guidance of the Group Activities Department.

The group workers in the third setting, the residential treatment center for children, are charged with the task of providing a leisure-time program during afternoons, evenings, and weekends. These play groups are formed in such a way as to create the kind of balance necessary for successful group interaction. Major emphasis is placed on careful dealing with surface behavior manifestations whenever these threaten the group's functioning. This approach is stressed especially because a similar program had failed earlier through the group worker's inability to withstand the severely pathological behavior of the children.

It is well known that in a residential treatment setting group dynamic factors are at work on at least three levels: (1) the broader institution as a whole, (2) the living-in or ward groupings, and (3) spontaneous or specially planned face-to-face groups. In all three of the residence centers considered, the group workers' skills

were utilized primarily for direct work with small groups. The workers' planful utilization of group psychological factors in the living-in groups varied from being minor in nature to being nonexistent. It was even less significant with respect to the whole institution or hospital community. This was due in part to the newness of the group work programs in relation to other, already established aspects of routines and professional functions. On the other hand, it is probable that in therapeutic settings, group workers feel on firmer ground working directly with small groups which approximate most nearly their earlier experiences in the community.

It is also of interest that all the contributors described their group procedures as directed at those areas of the patients' ego relatively untouched by the basic pathological processes. The importance of socialization was underscored as an end in itself as well as an opportunity for enhanced reality functioning. The dangers of withdrawal, regression, and dependency were counteracted by satisfying interpersonal relationships and group identifications. Self-expression was viewed as essential but within reality limits. While most groups fostered recreation or activity, there were some of the discussion type as well, in which the patients talked about their illness, the therapeutic measures, and the institution and the people in it. At no point did the group workers elicit or deal directly with regressive or pathological material.

In many instances the group work experience contributed to the patients' accessibility to individual and/or group psychotherapy. Difficulties, however, were sometimes encountered in maintaining lines of communication between the group workers and other professional staff, especially the clinicians. In two of the settings all the background information on individual patients was not available to the group workers prior to their first contact with the patient. There was also a problem of a

timely sharing of the group worker's observations and experiences.

MODIFICATIONS IN CONCEPTS AND TECHNIQUES

As might be expected, such broader treatment designs necessitate modifications in generic group work concepts and techniques. First of all, in psychiatric settings the group workers' expectations for the movement of individuals and of the group as a whole have to be narrowed significantly. Such a group's *esprit de corps* is often greatly if not permanently delayed. There is frequently prolonged and concentrated work with individual patients before they can even be "seduced" to partake in an activity. The pathology of the patients, furthermore, requires the group worker to assume a directive role at many points. With it goes the necessary modification of the axiom on the group's right for self-determination. These group workers need to possess much knowledge regarding the emotional aspects of individual and group behavior, especially in the sphere of motivation. When compared with usual group work practice, there is an incomparably greater need for individualization of each group member. There is, in addition, the necessity of tolerance for deviant behavior and planful control of group developments which might stimulate undue frustration and anxiety.

TRAINING OF WORKERS

What about the optimum preparation for this kind of work? Some people believe that the usual two-year group work curriculum taught at schools of social work is sufficient, provided the second field work placement occurs in a psychiatric setting. This view has also been expressed in the statement "Content of Professional Education for Social Group Workers in Medical, Psychiatric, and Institutional Settings," issued in December 1953 by the American Association of Group Workers. The ques-

tion here is whether it is humanly possible to offer adequate training of this kind in a two-year time span. This would include, over and above the basic social work and group work instruction, the complex areas of knowledge and skills pertaining to practice in a psychiatric setting. (This appears to be less of a problem in preparing group workers for medical or institutional placements.)

Some administrators and clinicians who have employed group workers in treatment-centered programs have been impressed by a frequently encountered discrepancy between the workers' excellent mastery of concepts and skills pertaining to group processes and those pertaining to individual personality development and psychopathology. This problem was also noted by Hollis and Taylor when they concluded: "Students not concentrating in the case-work sequence have often failed to secure much needed understanding of psychiatric and other content needed for working with individuals."⁸ This should not be very surprising when we consider the relative youth of group work as a professional course of study in social work. As Kaiser put it, group work is still in a formative and to some extent an ambivalent stage. In this connection, the full acceptance of psychiatric concepts and their integration into group work practice is still in its inception. Too often, when group workers speak of "individualizing clients" or of "intake" the data pertaining to personality factors tend to be relatively superficial. At best they are apt to focus on the individual personality only in its outer, environmental, and dynamic aspects with little reference to the genetic and intrapsychic ones. This was illustrated quite graphically in a committee report on "Individualizing Group Work Services" which appeared in *The Group*.⁹ We are here repeating the experience of social casework which also has moved

⁸ Hollis and Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁹ Vol. 13 (June 1951), p. 9.

Group Work and Group Psychotherapy

gradually to encompass more and more of the knowledge of the subjective, the unconscious, and the intrapsychic in the helping process. It is for these reasons that some leaders in the field have advocated a third-year course of study at schools of social work for a curriculum of group work in psychiatric settings. A year's postgraduate, supervised internship is preferred by others. Only a careful evaluation of practice coupled with further open discussion of these issues will provide us with the final answers to this problem.

PRACTICE OF GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY

A distinction has been made so far between general group work and group work in psychiatric settings on the one hand, and between these and group psychotherapy on the other. This is based on strong conviction regarding the importance of differentiating between the goals, the concepts, and the techniques of social group work and group psychotherapy. This does not include, however, the rigid belief encountered in some group therapy circles that social group workers should not practice group psychotherapy. A similar controversy is still afoot regarding caseworkers in the realm of individual psychotherapy. Perhaps the answer is that one should "view all psychotherapy, and with it group psychotherapy, as separate disciplines, complete in themselves. People from varied professional backgrounds—psychiatry, social casework, group work, or psychology—can practice psychotherapy, under adequate controls, provided they possess the necessary personality attributes and specialized clinical training and skills required for each particular job."¹⁰ This kind of an attitude is being accepted by an increasing number of people in the field. As Hastings said recently, "Personally I find difficulty in becoming exercised about who in the team does individual psychotherapy so long

as the therapist is well trained and is a person of integrity."¹¹ With respect to group psychotherapy it must be noted that it is in many ways a more complex and delicate instrument requiring therefore the utmost caution and discrimination. Gordon Hamilton, a leader in social casework, drew an analogy between group psychotherapy as a specialized form of group experience and individual psychotherapy as a specialization for casework. According to her "... any good therapy calls for considerable training beyond medical, psychiatric, or social work basic education, and also for special aptitudes."¹² As to the initial educational foundation for those social workers who are interested in group therapy, Lyon thought that "... a synthesis of the training of the disciplines of both social group work and social casework methods" might be desirable.¹³ For, besides a familiarity with the group process, a group therapist must possess a thorough understanding of personality theory and of psychopathology. With it goes the requirement for a high degree of self-awareness. There is also the problem of some supervised experience in individual psychotherapy. According to many authorities a minimum of a two-year period of such supervised experience is essential for even a general grasp of the nature of the therapeutic process.

NEW SPHERES

It can be seen from the above that the application and current training patterns in social group work lend themselves readily to adoption by psychiatric, medical, or institutional settings. The potential contributions of group work as a method in

¹¹ D. W. Hastings, "The Contribution of Orthopsychiatry to Psychiatry," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. 25 (July 1955), p. 460.

¹² *Theory and Practice of Social Casework* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), p. 256.

¹³ V. Lyon, "The Caseworker as Group Therapist," *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, Vol. 3 (April 1953), p. 198.

¹⁰ Scheidlinger, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

its own right, to the broader treatment design in hospitals, treatment homes, and rehabilitation centers are enormous. In the mental health field alone there are thousands of institutionalized patients all over the nation who would respond most favorably to group work services. Such group work could be applied in a parallel fashion, not infrequently even with the same patients, with group psychotherapy. These two approaches can complement each other very effectively as was demonstrated by Sloan.¹⁴

There is also the sphere of family life and parent education in which group workers despite their specialized skills have failed by and large to make an appearance. One such experiment by a group worker

described in the literature¹⁵ seemed to have brought most promising results. The application of group work to helping so-called "exceptional" children with emotional or physical handicaps in the community represents another variant worthy of further exploration.

There is no limit, except that of available personnel, to the potentials for change and growth inherent in all professionally guided group influence attempts. Social group work and group psychotherapy—with their distinct backgrounds and methodological systems—have many opportunities for enriching each other. They can also offer the necessary leadership to other fields in utilizing group procedures for better and happier living.

¹⁴ Marion B. Sloan, "The Special Contribution of Therapeutic Group Work in a Psychiatric Setting," *The Group*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (April 1953), p. 11.

¹⁵ Olive L. Crocker, "Family Life Education—Some New Findings," *Social Casework*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (March 1955), p. 106.

BY KATHERINE A. KENDALL, Ph.D.

Orthodoxy and Paradoxes: Dilemmas of Social Work Education

A PARADOX, BY dictionary definition, is something apparently absurd or incredible, yet possibly true. A dilemma, for the purposes of this paper, can be any difficult choice. Orthodoxy, according to Webster, means conformity to conventional belief. This term is defined because of its too-frequent misuse these days to describe any position which attributes some virtue to our present methods of social work education.

Paradoxes abound when social work education is under fire. We are told on the one hand that our efforts to impart, as systematic knowledge, what we have painfully learned about the helping process have led to overprofessionalization with resulting obliteration of whatever common sense, natural warmth, or spirit of dedication our students may have brought to us. But then in the same breath we are advised that our failure to create a systematic body of knowledge and skill as a base for our operations in practice precludes the possibility of our activity being described as professional. We hear, from within and outside our ranks, that our education is too narrowly technical and that our graduates have little or no breadth of vision. At the same time, some of the agencies employing our graduates complain that our education has become so broad that the graduate lacks

specific technical competence for the jobs at hand. And while these complaints ring in our ears, we find ourselves flinching beneath the constant, bitter, and justified reproach that we are not producing enough of this inadequate product.

Despair might easily be our portion as we face the dilemmas which are posed by so many different and mutually contradictory expectations and demands. The schools, of course, are not alone in facing dilemmas. As Charlotte Towle has so aptly put it for the profession at large: "Social work, by its youth and nature, has had a peculiar problem in being expected to be all things to all men. Consequently, it has served beneath and beyond its capacities."¹ The schools, too, serve beneath and beyond their capacities and my hope, in this presentation, is that we may arrive at a clearer understanding than many of us now have of what may legitimately be expected of a professional school and what legitimately lies outside of its purview.

Schools of social work were created in this and in fifty-two other countries in response to a recognized need. There has been no diminution of the hope and the faith which have led countries in all parts of the world to look beyond the older established professions and outside the traditional academic disciplines to this new profession of social work for competence in dealing with a wide range and variety of social and human problems. Indeed, each succeeding session of the Social Commission

KATHERINE A. KENDALL is consultant on educational services for the Council on Social Work Education. Her paper was presented at the annual dinner of the University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work Alumni Association in Philadelphia in March 1956, and at a dinner meeting of the St. Louis University Alumni Association held in St. Louis on May 22, 1956.

¹ Charlotte Towle, *The Learner in Education for the Professions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. 16.

of the United Nations dramatically highlights the increasing recognition and acceptance of training for social work as a high priority activity in every country which is concerned with promoting human and social welfare. This, perhaps, is one of the reasons why defeat can never be our destiny.

In considering the dilemmas faced by the schools in the light of the paradoxical statements voiced by their critics, let us begin with the field of social work practice. What is it that the employing agencies want from the schools and what is it that the schools are equipped to give? Despite the reproaches, we can assume, I believe, a wide area of acceptance of the purposes and even the results of social work education. The marked increase in recent years in scholarship aid from public and private agency sources, the proposed extension, through federal legislation, of training grants in public assistance and in correction, and the growing number of agency and practitioner members in the Council on Social Work Education give evidence of such support. The field of practice wants and needs the professional schools. What, then, is to be said about the tendency, in certain quarters, to deny the efficacy of our present educational programs?

EXPECTATIONS AS TO TECHNICAL COMPETENCE

Let us examine, first, the contention that schools of social work, under present curriculum policy, do not adequately prepare for immediate competence on specific jobs in specific fields of practice. It is not difficult to understand and sympathize with this point of view. The values of the generic approach are perhaps easier to accept in theory than in reality. A series of courses on a specific area of practice, *e.g.*, child welfare, coupled with drill in the specific operations of a particular agency, *e.g.*, a children's home society, would in a number of respects more adequately equip a new graduate to function quickly and easily in

an adoption service. Yet, in spite of recognition of a certain validity in the point of view, I think we must still say that the expectations underlying it are unrealistic and even self-defeating.

You are all familiar with the overwhelming evidence of the mobility of social workers. Your own careers undoubtedly illustrate the need for educational programs that prepare for a lifetime of professional service rather than for a first job in a specific agency setting. All of us, too, are familiar with the differences between craft or technical training and professional education. What may not be so well known, I fear, are the choices which a school of social work must make in determining the content of the curriculum and in balancing expectations and pressures from the field of practice against educationally defensible objectives.

Let us imagine that a school of social work finds itself under pressure from the professional community to prepare staff for a newly developing field of practice. Scholarships will be offered and when scholarships beckon, students follow. The school, in this situation, has several choices open to it. The easy way is to add a series of new courses with titles and detailed content appropriately suggestive of the school's interest in meeting community needs. This approach makes it possible for the school in its advertising and elsewhere to relate scholarships to specific curriculum offerings and to point with pride to its responsiveness to new developments. But along comes another new development and still another or perhaps a gone-to-seed field of practice develops new aspirations. What happens then? More new courses? The easy way begins to look like abdication of educational responsibility. Collections of courses on specific fields of practice do not add up to a professional curriculum, with adequate coverage of basic content, balance in subject matter, and progression in learning for all students.

The alternative approach is to analyze

Social Work

Orthodoxy and Paradoxes

the requirements of the new or rejuvenated field of practice to discover the elements of knowledge and skill necessary for competent performance of the functions involved. Upon analysis, the school may be able to say to the representatives of practice:

The basic knowledge required for your activity is here and here and here in our present curriculum. We would like to enrich our present curriculum with certain knowledge specific to your area of practice and we see a possibility of enlarging content in this and that course and sequence. We may decide for a limited period of time to give one special course in order that we may undergo the discipline of factoring out the content relevant to your new area of practice and thus ensure for ourselves a better understanding of what to incorporate in the several sequences of the total curriculum. We see the possibility of helping you develop field placements and we hope that your operations will stimulate student research. If our graduates accept employment in your agency, we believe they will approach their tasks with beginning professional competence, professional attitudes, and a capacity both to absorb and use new knowledge and to develop greater skill, but they will still have much to learn about the what, the why, and the how of your particular activity.

This approach, as you see, calls for shared expectations by school and agency which may be somewhat different from those the agency originally had in mind. The agency must incorporate within its expectations established educational objectives for the total profession and must assume certain educational responsibilities of its own, first, in relation to field instruction and possible student research and, second, in relation to the continuing professional development of the graduate.

EXPECTATIONS AS TO BREADTH OF TRAINING

The approach to social work education characterized as generic is now almost uni-

versally accepted by the schools. While this approach has given rise to the criticisms just recounted, it nevertheless has long been advocated by the advance guard of social work practice and has recently been endorsed in a statement of great significance for our field. This statement, which was prepared for the Council's Commission on Accreditation by a group representing the major fields of practice, recommends that schools of social work be accredited on the basis of the generic two-year curriculum and that there should be no accrediting of any specializations by any definition.² Since this recommendation represents a significant change in educational policy, it was presented as a principle to be adopted and the question of when it should go into effect has been left for further study and discussion. The recommendation was accompanied by a series of proposals for action by the Council on Social Work Education to ensure that the content needed for effective practice in a variety of settings is or will be incorporated into the basic curriculum. While many problems remain to be solved before the full significance of the new policy statement may be realized, the recommendation nevertheless represents recognition that the social work curriculum must be broadly conceived and should prepare adequately for a wide area of professional practice.

Yet, despite this development, the most frequently voiced criticism of social work education today has to do with its presumed emphasis on narrow technical training. A stereotype persists to the effect that students are permitted, even encouraged, to limit their view of social work and its practice to microscopic psychological examination of the therapeutic relationship. Indeed, it is sometimes asserted that social work education itself is little more than an educationally rationalized therapeutic experience.

² *Social Work Education*, bimonthly news publication of the Council on Social Work Education, Vol. 4, No. 1 (February 1956), p. 2.

Insufficient knowledge of the present configuration of courses in the social work curriculum may explain, in part, the persistence of this misconception, but I suspect that we must look further for the total explanation. Again, we are faced with laudable but somewhat visionary expectations that pose a dilemma of major proportions for our curriculum planners.

When responsible leaders in our own ranks and enlightened persons from outside of our field decry that the schools do not prepare for leadership and social statesmanship, they express the fears of all of us that social work is not playing its proper role in the formation and execution of progressive social policy. It is to be expected that some measure of responsibility for this lack should be attributed to the professional schools where the twig is bent.

The dilemma, of course, is posed when one considers what constitutes preparation for social statesmanship. What curriculum ingredients and learning experiences produce competence in social action, leadership in effecting social change? And what, realistically, can the schools accomplish in these directions within the two-year training program? Let us grant, for the purposes of argument, that, while heartening progress has been made in restoring the "social" to the social work curriculum, the schools are still operating beneath their capacities in this regard. But as we encourage schools to do more, let us not demand that they operate beyond their capacities. Qualities of leadership may be discovered and fostered in the master's program, but no curriculum, whether in social work, medicine, law, or any other professional school, can guarantee, or even presume to have as its primary objective, the production of sure-fire leaders.

What the social work curriculum in its totality can and must do is this: It can offer a view of social work that encompasses the cause and prevention as well as the treatment of social ills. It can include specific subject matter designed to provide

knowledge about social welfare development, together with the underlying factors which motivate or impede social development and social change. It can stimulate critical analysis of current social issues and the genesis and effects of prevailing social policy. It can foster in the student a strong identification with and deep commitment to his profession as a social force. It can, finally, lay the foundations for a steadily enlarging professional competence, rooted in some knowledge of the science, a beginning skill in the art, and an emerging conviction about the philosophical tenets of social work practice. It is my belief that the sum total of such learning experience together with unequivocal faculty example would instill in all social workers of the future a predisposition to contribute, in ways large or small, to social betterment. If all of our graduates have this predisposition (and the present curriculum *at its best*, which implies faculty capable of inspiring emulation, can realistically be expected to produce such a result), our chances are greatly improved that some of the beginning workers of today will develop into the leaders and social statesmen of tomorrow.

EXPECTATIONS AS TO SCHOLARSHIP

Are we overprofessionalized or not at all a profession? This is the final paradox which I would like to have us consider. Remember that a paradox contains within it the possibility of truth.

The charge of overprofessionalization appears to be tinged with a nostalgic yearning for the good old days when dedication and intuition very often served as a substitute for knowledge and skill. Professionalization, it is charged, has made us less responsive than our prototypes of another era to human need, less flexible in our methods of helping, less warm in our relationships. Again, I fear, we are dealing with a stereotype which hardly seems to exist in our own experience with fellow-

Orthodoxy and Paradoxes

workers, but which must have existed somewhere to produce this unflattering image.

The problem posed for social work education by charges such as this is, perhaps, of only minor dimensions, but it has to be noted even though we would not or could not, if we tried, turn back the clock. We must continue to impart the knowledge painstakingly gleaned from the hunches and the trial and error methods of our predecessors. We must continue to provide learning opportunities which will enable the student to understand the characteristics of the professional relationship and the responsibilities inherent in its use as a means of rendering service. This kind of learning does tend to induce a self-consciousness in the beginner as he tries to respond objectively in a situation which engages him emotionally. We know, from long years of experience, however, that the emergence of professional self-discipline in our students does not rob them of warmth of feeling or of compassion for others. Of course, we make mistakes at the point of admission, and, later, in permitting unsuitable students to continue. To that extent, certainly, we are responsible when our graduates use so-called professionalism as a defense against meeting the heavy demands of professional service.

The charge of "underprofessionalism" is usually accompanied by a query about, or request to describe, the body of knowledge and skill distinctive to the profession of social work. When this question is posed, our self-doubts on this very point and our well-known humility seem to have a paralyzing effect. I have yet to see the questioner queried: "And pray, sir, what, in two paragraphs, is the body of knowledge distinctive to your discipline?" The answer or lack of it might possibly prove reassuring and might even have a salutary effect on the sometimes pathological aspects of our humility.

In dealing with this question of our body of knowledge and professional status, let us grant immediately the kernel of truth. Much of our knowledge is incomplete and

probably always will be because of the nature of the phenomena with which we deal. Much of it is highly tentative and, as is true in all professional fields, a good part of it is borrowed and reshaped for use in our own field. There is no question at all about the need for better identification of the knowledge peculiar to social work, for expansion of that knowledge, and for utilization of the pertinent knowledge available from other disciplines. The question here revolves again around legitimate expectations of the graduate schools in this respect and the choices which have to be made if those expectations are to be realized.

Many universities place schools of social work in a twilight zone between the traditional professional schools, e.g., medicine and law, and the graduate departments of the various social sciences. Dr. G. Lester Anderson, a university administrator, described for us at the 1956 Annual Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education what he characterized as universal misunderstandings between all professional schools and their parent universities.

First, [with respect to] personnel policies: On the one hand, the university sets much store by the symbols Ph.D. and scholarly contributions to knowledge as it administers appointments and promotion. The professional schools wish greater emphasis to be placed on professional competence and experience and on contributions to society that are professional rather than scholarly. Second, [with respect to] control of the program (curriculum): The university seems more interested in providing for the students' breadth of learning and in their knowing and understanding as a scholar might know and understand. The professional schools are more interested in providing for their students relative mastery of a field for performance and experiences that develop professional skill or technique and point of view (albeit with the why as well as the how).³

³ G. Lester Anderson, "The Professional School in the University," in *Education for Social Work* (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1956).

Schools of social work certainly share in these misunderstandings. Indeed, because of the twilight zone to which I have referred, our schools are more openly exposed than some other professional schools to the problem of scholarly versus practice-oriented activity. We conceive our task as that of professional education, *i.e.*, education for use, but the universities frequently make or wish to make the same demands upon us with respect to scholarship that are made upon the academic departments. To complicate the problem, the self-image of the average faculty member in a school of social work is more often that of the "doer" than the scholar. This is an inevitable result of the nature of our professional activity. The detachment of the research scientist is a luxury we find we cannot afford in our master's education or in our practice. Like all professional disciplines, we must act on the basis of the best knowledge available to us at the moment. The client across the desk, the problem in the community cannot wait until our practitioners or our students in field work test exhaustively the knowledge needed for immediate constructive action.

In this context, what are legitimate expectations with respect to scholarship in the professional schools? The primary job, as suggested by Dr. Anderson, is to provide "a relative mastery of a field for performance and experiences that develop professional skill or techniques and point of view (albeit with the why as well as the how)." Students must be made aware of the tentativeness of the knowledge we impart but in such a way that they are not inhibited from putting it to immediate use in field work learning. The time and attention which can be devoted to student research *per se* are necessarily limited. It is not a realistic expectation, therefore, that schools of social work, in the master's program, can produce both scholars and practitioners. The best they can do is to produce practitioners, habituated to an orderly method of approach to problem-solving and attuned

to the need for constant scrutiny of the theory underlying their practice.

If we say, and I think we must, that our schools cannot produce scholars but, rather, practitioners with an approach which may be characterized as scholarly, what of the expectations as to scholarship within the faculty? The university has the expectation that all of its faculties should evince qualities of scholarship and engage in scholarly activity. This is a legitimate expectation if the university provides the conditions necessary for scholarly achievement.

As we all know, our schools of social work are, in the main, understaffed and financially undernourished. Scholars require time to think and to ask and answer the questions which will lead to the expansion of a body of knowledge. Scholars in our field must have some knowledge of social work practice so that the questions posed have relevance to our own professional operations and to the development and improvement of the social services. No other discipline can do this job for us although we can and should enlist the co-operation of other disciplines in getting the job done. All of this means that our social work faculties must be adequate in size and in their professional preparation to enable our schools to achieve the two-pronged objective of producing practitioners and creating new knowledge.

The advent of doctoral programs in social work offers us a ray of hope for the future. An increasing number of faculty members are embarking on advanced study and a large proportion of practitioners who enroll in advanced programs go immediately or eventually into teaching. This is clearly a bootstraps operation which can succeed if we face up to certain choices now available to us. The choices, as I see them, are these:

Our doctoral programs can provide more of the same as the master's program (albeit with a greater emphasis on scholarly achievement) or they can focus much more directly than many of them now do on the

Orthodoxy and Paradoxes

preparation of scholars who are equipped to undertake basic research and to collaborate effectively with scholars from other fields. It would be my hope that they would choose the second path.

There is a choice, too, which would have to be made by faculty members themselves. The faculties in our professional schools of social work can continue to think and act in terms of "contributions to society which are professional rather than scholarly" or they can make a conscious effort to achieve a balance between the two. You will note that I am not demanding an either-or decision between professional and scholarly contributions. The very nature of our education and its close tie to practice requires faculty involvement in the work and concerns of the professional community. University recognition of this fact as a desirable and inevitable concomitant of professional education for social work might lead to more adequate staffing and, thus, more time and opportunity for scholarly as well as professional contributions.

A new self-image for faculty members which blends the scholar with the doer might lead to some restriction of community service which is not directly related to the educational activities of the school. This will not be easy as the community as well as the university has certain expectations, many of them legitimate in terms of the needs and the present stage of development of the profession. But, in this as in so many other decisions which have had to be made by social work educators through the years, the long view should prevail.

THE LIMITS OF A CURRICULUM

These, then, are some of the dilemmas which are posed for us by the charges of our critics. There are still others which

have been explored in considerable detail in our literature, for example, the relationship of social work knowledge to the social sciences, the role of undergraduate departments in preparing for the social services. These and many more will be analyzed in the three-year curriculum study which has recently been launched by the council. The present professional curriculum will come under scrutiny. If there is merit in what we are now doing, I am sure it will be recognized. If better ways of performing this important task of educating personnel for an exacting and highly responsible field of service are proposed, the schools will be the first to seize upon them and put them to the test. Orthodoxy in the sense of rigid conformity to conventional belief can hardly be attributed to an educational regime that has subjected itself to so much self-analysis through the years and has changed so radically from decade to decade. What we must guard against is not the suspicion of orthodoxy but the possible invalidity of the demands placed upon us and the possibly visionary character of the expectations underlying those demands.

The social work curriculum is, after all, only a curriculum. It is not a miracle drug which, when properly administered, will cure the evils of society. It is not a magic wand which, when waved over average and, we hope, above-average human material, will produce professional saints, dedicated pioneers, and profound scholars. The task before us is difficult enough without the complications of contradictory and unrealistic aspirations. Let us strive constantly to improve our educational programs, but let us also stand firm on what we already know from successful hard-won experience to be of tested value in our efforts to prepare qualified social workers for service to society.

BY RUTH NEWTON STEVENS AND FRED A. HUTCHINSON

A New Concept of Supervision Is Tested

THE YOUNG PROFESSION of social work owes much of its vitality and knowledge to the immeasurable contributions of good supervision. Recognition of these contributions has not, however, precluded the necessity for continuing scrutiny of the supervisory system. In recent years, questions have arisen from many quarters about how effectively supervision is meeting the needs of the profession, particularly those of the trained, experienced practitioner. Seven years ago, the Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon, on a planned experimental basis, started using supervision in a manner which was a considerable departure from the traditional system.¹ What began as an experiment has now become our accepted way of working and a genuine part of our professional philosophy.

This change was the direct result of a growing conviction that we were not making maximum use of professional talent, due largely, we believed, to some inherent contradictions in the supervisory situation itself. We observed that when caseworkers wish to continue as practitioners they generally do so at the sacrifice of prestige and salary. With few exceptions, in order to reach higher levels of status and pay they must become either supervisors or administrators. Herbert H. Aptekar points this out effectively by saying, "... it is generally assumed that if one is a good caseworker the next logical step in professional advancement is to become a supervisor. Better salaries are paid to supervisors. Moreover,

in our culture, prestige generally accrues to the person who knows enough to 'over-see' the work of another."² We agree with this statement, but we question whether such conditions should exist.

The designations of *caseworker*, *supervisor*, and *administrator* have lost much of their worth as descriptions of function, and have come almost to indicate levels of performance. The assumption is far too general that the title *administrator* implies maximum skill, and that the title *supervisor* means a "super caseworker." Conversely, the caseworker is seen as an embryo supervisor or administrator. Because caseworkers naturally want to advance and because selection of supervisory staff is usually based on the performance of individuals as practitioners, the result has been that a good many social workers find themselves in positions where their interests and activities are in conflict.

What happens when the supervisor in his dual capacity of administrator and teacher attempts to fulfill his responsibilities? If the supervisory process functions satisfactorily, we say that it is a two-way learning experience. Expectations are, however, that the pupil will learn considerably more than the teacher. Consequently, the prestige and responsibility of the supervisor are built up, thereby diminishing the values placed on the actual practice of the profession.

Need for concern would be minimal if

RUTH NEWTON STEVENS and FRED A. HUTCHINSON are staff members of the Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon. Mrs. Stevens is in the Infant Adoption Division, Mr. Hutchinson is chairman of the Older Children's Adoption Division.

¹ The Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon is a private, licensed, statewide child-caring and child-placing agency.

² "The Significance of Dependence and Independence in Supervision," *Social Casework*, Vol. 35, No. 6 (June 1954), p. 238.

New Concept of Supervision

this "over" and "under" relationship sometimes came to an end. In no other profession is the trained experienced practitioner expected to remain indefinitely under the kind of supervision that has grown up in social work. This has raised questions outside the field as to the professional stature of social workers. For instance, when the Census Bureau was considering the professions to be tabulated in 1950, it first questioned whether social work should be included, since its members apparently never arrived at a place where they were responsible and accountable for their own acts.

For the profession itself, we believe that, without recognizing it, many practitioners have been inhibited by the supervisory structure from trying new ideas. We want to emphasize that we believe this to be true where the relationship between supervisor and supervisee is of the best quality, presupposing on both sides intelligence, imagination, sensitivity, and conscientiousness. There still remains the fact that it is the supervisor's responsibility to evaluate the practitioner's performance, ultimately affecting his status and pay. Consciously or unconsciously, this produces limitation.

Dr. Charlotte G. Babcock, psychiatrist, who had as patients a number of social workers, describes with serious concern the fact that many anxieties were accentuated by the supervisory system.³ Mrs. Rochelle Indelman, in a discussion of supervision and the advanced practitioner, says, "... supervision has hesitated to apply to its own function one of the basic and well-tested principles of case work practice, namely, separation. . . . The real test of the effectiveness of a helping relationship lies in the way a person functions after he has separated from the source which gave impetus to this growth. This almost elementary principle seems to be overlooked in the relationship between supervisor and

supervisee. . . . It is puzzling, indeed, to see that a discipline which so strongly indoctrinates confidence in the human self should not be able to muster enough strength of conviction to trust its own purpose and processes."⁴

We have no quarrel with the basic tenets of good supervision as developed by such authorities as Bertha C. Reynolds, Virginia P. Robinson,⁵ and others but with the way supervision is used. Because it has been found so useful in the student and internship period, we believe the field has not allowed itself to venture to discover other possibilities for the mature, experienced practitioner. Rather, continuous refinement of what we already have has been going on without consideration that other plans of organization might utilize talents more effectively and allow greater freedom for growth.

NEW CONCEPT INITIATED

On May 1, 1949, the Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon began an experiment to try to solve some of the problems posed by this dilemma. While the change started with a recognition by the staff that our supervisory plan was not functioning to our satisfaction, the transition which eventually occurred was not developed in an atmosphere of dissatisfaction or discontent. Comparative and close evaluation of our organization and that of other agencies led us to believe that within the framework of good traditional supervision our own plan was functioning quite well. We concluded therefore that the fault lay in this framework itself in ways which we have already indicated.

This change was the natural outgrowth of the conviction of both the agency staff and board that the most vital work was

⁴ "Supervision and the Advanced Practitioner," *Social Work Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (January 1955), p. 18.

⁵ Virginia P. Robinson, *Supervision in Social Casework* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1939).

³ "Social Work as Work," *Social Casework*, Vol. 34, No. 10 (December 1953), p. 415.

that done by the practitioners. The board had already cemented its conviction by taking an important step in regard to salary. The rate of pay was divorced from job classification so that supervisors would not necessarily receive more than caseworkers. Instead, salary was based on the amount of training, the length and kind of experience, and performance on the job. This was and still is true for every member of professional staff. It may not be essential that this step be taken prior to the commencement of this plan, but its early incorporation is, we feel, mandatory. This undertaking has also been facilitated by the fact that our administrator has full casework training and experience. This may not be necessary in all settings, but it is essential that he have an understanding and acceptance of casework principles.

Starting from the premise that the casework job is *the* job, the staff then tried to work out a comfortable, effective way to meet administrative, teaching, and consultative needs. It was recognized at once that new persons, experienced or otherwise, coming to the agency would need a period of traditional supervision to learn the agency, its policies, its way of working, and in turn to allow the agency to know them. To this extent, the traditional system has been utilized. In this agency, we have used the term *supervision* to apply only to this period, usually a year, recognizing that during this period of adaptation, learning, and orientation, a protective and somewhat controlled situation needed to be provided for the caseworker.

The growth to full professional responsibility cannot be made in one jump, but requires a series of careful steps which may differ considerably from one person to another. There is a time when every trained practitioner should arrive at this goal although the period required will vary from person to person. This does not imply that professional growth stops at any given point—quite the contrary. Just as we assume that the doctor's professional

growth has a long way to go after he leaves the protection of internship and residency, we anticipate continuous professional development in our field.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Since it was necessary in this new system to provide an adequate administrative structure, it was decided that chairmen of divisions would be appointed by the state director to carry out these responsibilities.⁶ This was not a matter of simply finding a new name for "supervisor." The chairmen function quite differently. Because they supervise only new members of staff, there are considerable periods of time when they are not supervising anyone. Therefore, in addition to their administrative responsibilities, they can devote a substantial amount of time to direct practice. In some instances, orientation supervision is given by the director of children's services. In any case, the decision of who gives this early supervision and when the new person is ready for the step into self-determined use of consultation is an administrative one.

Provision was made for consultation by allowing members of the staff to secure help from those whose experience and talents seemed most helpful in any particular situation. In doing this, we felt that we were only making legitimate what already takes place in most agencies, regardless of permission and often with misunderstanding and guilt. Such guilt can be a two-way destructive force, with the caseworker feeling disloyal to the supervisor who in turn feels that she has somehow failed in her duties and must redouble her efforts.

It was felt that there would be a good deal of variation in the way consulting conferences would be employed. One staff member might not wish to give as much consultation as others; another might re-

⁶ In the Boys and Girls Aid Society there are four divisions: Confidential Maternity Service, Foster Care, Infant Adoption, and Older Children's Adoption.

New Concept of Supervision

quest regular consultation with a specific person over a period of time. In addition to these individual conferences, the agency continued to use the consultative services of its two psychiatrists and its clinical psychologist. Provision was also made for group conferences, joint work projects, and a carefully constructed staff development program, the hub of which was our staff meetings. The state director and the director of children's services continued in their administrative and co-ordinating roles.

The change was accomplished smoothly with a minimum of confusion and very little disturbance to agency program. The members of staff, of course, had a good many questions as to how this system would work. After seven years, however, they are unanimous in saying that they feel the benefits of the change have been so great that they would not consider a return to traditional supervision. Observing ourselves today, it seems to us that the paramount gains have been the increasing sense of closeness and professional pride about the agency's work. There has been freedom to try new ideas and to make mistakes, with the full knowledge that professional growth means some stumbling on the way to competence and skill. Far-reaching changes have been made in agency program during these years, but these have seemed to come naturally when staff was ready to make them, because they sprang from the staff itself in the form of professional advances rather than from above as administrative decisions. The staff has developed a greater awareness of the capacities, strengths, and weaknesses of its individual members without apparent damage to personalities. Adjustments to utilize workers to best advantage have come about naturally, often initiated by staff itself. The attitude is one of co-operative sharing of professional goals rather than of competition within the staff.

FUNCTIONING OF PLAN

In general, the plan has worked out as originally drafted with only minor changes

in emphasis and interpretation. What are the answers to the doubts we had as we began the experiment? Primarily, we wondered if consultation would be used, or if staff members would fall prey to the temptation to use all their time to get work done without the vital corollary of improving while they worked. We can now testify that consultation has been effectively used by all members of staff. As anticipated, there have been wide variations in its use. The general impression of staff is that this has been highly beneficial because supervision has been sought when the practitioner had most need of it and from the persons it was felt would be most helpful. There have been occasions when staff members have exchanged places with each other as consultants because this seemed beneficial to them. New staff persons coming to the agency during this period have adjusted to the plan with enthusiasm; naturally they have gone through a period when they were learning to work in this different framework. These new workers have made the transition from the orientation period of traditional supervision to this self-determined use of consultation with considerable ease. New persons supervised by their division chairmen during their orientation periods have not hesitated to seek consultation elsewhere as they wished it.

It is true that some staff members ask for more consultation than others, and that some give more than others. This seems dynamic and helpful. We have not found that staff members have become isolated. With the kind of sharing that goes on through group conferences and work projects, isolation would be difficult, if not impossible. In this climate, sharing ideas and experiences is stimulating rather than threatening. There has been generous use of what might be termed conference-consultations, where three or more workers find themselves concerned about some phase of the work and meet together voluntarily. It may end there, or may progress

into a general staff meeting if the subject is of wide enough interest. It is significant that these privileges to meet and consult have not been abused. Administrative guidance is always available to maintain a balance between the individual needs and interests of staff members and the common goals of the agency.

The growth in professional stature of individual workers has been very apparent. Staff members have discovered capacities within themselves of which they were not previously aware; timidities have been overcome and uncertainties voluntarily brought forth where they could be examined, recognized for what they are, and often minimized or eliminated.

EVALUATIONS

This leads naturally to evaluation. Under this system, self- and group evaluation is going on all the time. We believe that social workers on our staff are unusually aware of the areas in which they work with greatest facility and those which are most difficult for them. These discoveries have been made dynamically, seemingly divorced from administration; that is, they have not been directly associated in the worker's mind or in anyone else's with their effect on promotion and pay. Evaluations for pay increases and recommendations are finally in the hands of the state director and director of children's services, but long before such decisions are made (and by that time they seem almost incidental), each worker is aware of where he stands. The state director and director of children's services are in touch with all phases of the work through conferences, meetings, records, and consultations. Formal written evaluations have not been used as a part of staff development. When anyone leaves the staff, a written evaluation is made in order that recommendations may be provided.

We are convinced that professional competence has been sharpened. At the risk of being considered overenthusiastic, or

even naive, we feel sure our staff is freer and more eager to reach a high standard of work because we can share meaningful experiences with each other in a way that makes them more helpful. This process of dividing the consultative, evaluative, and administrative roles seems also to have removed the petty jealousies and cliques which exist in some measure in almost all organizations. Here they truly seem absent. We know it is not because we are basically any different than other groups of human beings, but because the system under which we are functioning has made them unnecessary and extraneous. Interestingly enough, no one has left the agency during this period because of the lure of another job.

We recognize that the plan as we are using it is geared to an agency where all members are professionally trained and experienced. Our agency is small, with nineteen persons on the professional staff, and this no doubt facilitates experimentation. There are fewer rules and regulations necessary in an agency such as this, which results in greater opportunity for staff participation in shaping policy and practice. We are convinced, however, that modifications of this plan can be adapted to different and larger organizations. Its flexibility is one of its chief recommendations.

Many executives have found themselves in a dilemma which we believe is minimized in this plan. Executives naturally want administrative assistants with administrative ability; yet, because this function has usually been tied in with supervision, they have frequently found themselves having to choose between a person who has strengths in one area or the other. Here no such choice is necessary; strengths can be utilized where they fit best to the benefit of the individuals and to the agency.

In the closing comments of her recent book, Bertha Reynolds writes, "Shall we let existing forms of social work, full of contradictions as they are, shape us to their mold? Shall we let customs which have prevailed

New Concept of Supervision

in our agencies for so long that nobody thinks about them any more determine our practice?"⁷ We hope that this commentary on our experience will be accepted in the spirit of Miss Reynolds' challenge. We

⁷ *Social Work and Social Living* (New York: Citadel Press, 1951), p. 175.

know that experimentation in all sorts of settings and under all kinds of conditions is essential to the development of sound practice, and that this is only one small demonstration. We are convinced, however, that it is a real step forward toward the goal of professional maturity.

BY RALPH M. KRAMER

Dynamics of Teamwork in the Agency, Community, and Neighborhood

PERHAPS IT IS because teamwork—whatever it may connote—is often regarded as “everyone’s business” that it frequently becomes nobody’s business. While continuous and specialized leadership in this task is indispensable, there seems to be a growing recognition that every direct service agency and its administrative components—executive, staff, and board—all have some responsibility in this sometimes nebulous process of achieving teamwork. This implies that no one group in the agency or community has a monopoly on the responsibility for teamwork, and that no group can consistently evade its own responsibility.¹

NEED FOR INTERAGENCY TEAMWORK

There are at least four major forces accounting for the greater need for and emphasis on teamwork today: (1) the increasing number of public and private agencies; (2) the continuous development of a wide range of community services; (3) the growth of professional specializations; (4) the emerging awareness of the basic unity of all health, welfare, and recreational agencies. As a result, it has been estimated that a typical youth-serv-

ing agency would be involved in various co-operative relationships with at least eighteen different community agencies as they affect more than a dozen different aspects of its program.² Nevertheless, it is not easy to overcome the compartmentalization of much of our services today, so often agency-centered instead of community-centered. For this reason, the argument for really effective teamwork must begin with recognition and acceptance of the following six principles which might constitute a creed:

1. We are all members of a single, inclusive profession of social work united by a common philosophy and objective—to help people attain satisfactory personal and social goals.

2. We are all concerned with the same human needs and problems.

3. We all share a common body of specialized knowledge which is applicable to these problems.

4. We all have a common core of basic professional methods, skills, and processes which are applicable in our dealings with individuals, groups, and communities.

5. We all share certain fundamental concepts such as the right of self-determination of individuals and groups; the importance of a nonjudgmental attitude; the recognition of causal factors in be-

RALPH M. KRAMER is the executive director of the Richmond-El Cerrito Community Chest and the West Contra Costa Community Welfare Council. This article was adapted from a paper originally presented at the Third Annual Institute for Group Work and Recreation Workers in November 1955 under the auspices of the University of California, the American Association of Group Workers and the California State Recreation Commission.

¹ For a development of this point of view, see Ray Johns and David F. De Marche, *Community Organization and Agency Responsibility* (New York: Association Press, 1951), pp. 6-7, 81-83.

² Harleigh B. Trecker, *Group Process in Administration*, 2nd ed. (New York: The Woman's Press, 1950), p. 136.

Dynamics of Teamwork

havior, and the confidential nature of any material exchanged dealing with our work.

6. We are on common ground in that we serve the same community and the people in it, and therefore we can make a more significant contribution if we work together than if we work independently.

So far, we have been concerned with teamwork between social agencies. This is, however, only one-half of the picture. If such co-operative relationships are to be fully effective, they must not be restricted to agency executives and staff members only but must involve citizens in the community served. There is, therefore, teamwork between agencies of all sorts, and teamwork between these same agencies and representatives of the community they serve. This is represented structurally, for example, in the differences between a council of social agencies, a community welfare council, and a community or neighborhood co-ordinating council.

A council of social agencies involves only representatives of the health, welfare, and recreation agencies and covers the area of an entire city. A community welfare council has a broader membership base and embraces all operating agencies, governmental and voluntary, and includes many community groups and citizens' organizations who are interested in adequate services. A community or neighborhood co-ordinating council is built upon the interests of citizens in a small locality and is concerned with any problem which arouses concern in the neighborhood.

THE CONCEPT OF TEAMWORK

It may be helpful to conceive of teamwork in terms of a continuum with seven stages: (1) acquaintance, (2) exchange of information (communication), (3) consultation, (4) referrals, (5) planning and co-ordination, (6) concurrent co-operative service, (7) joint operating responsibility.

As can be seen, these co-operative relationships increase in intensity and complexity as we proceed from (1) to (7). Individually and in combination, it is suggested, these seven relationships are the referents of the term "teamwork."³

Before examining some of the barriers and blocks to teamwork, we should note some of the prerequisites for any one of these seven levels of co-operative relationships. Certainly it is expecting too much of agencies that do not have any teamwork within their own staff to participate meaningfully with other groups. Consequently, *intra-agency teamwork* in the form of adequate communication and recognized channels of authority would seem to be a precondition. In addition, it would be necessary for the agency to have a clear conception of its function and relationship to other community groups, and for its staff to be familiar with this. Hopefully, the agency would also have developed a community strategy in writing, noting the groups with whom it needs to maintain co-operative relationships and the types of representation needed. To implement this, there should be a planned method for staff participation in community relations and an organized procedure for reporting back and involving the agency in a responsible manner.⁴

SIX BARRIERS TO INTERAGENCY TEAMWORK

In view of these rather rigorous requirements, it is not surprising to learn that a recent study of co-operation among agencies found no less than twenty-three different blocks to effective teamwork!⁵ For our purposes, it is possible to reduce them to the following six major obstacles: (1) lack of knowledge of other agencies and the com-

³ This analysis of the concept of teamwork and the obstacles to co-operation was suggested by the study of Johns and De Marche, *op. cit.*, pp. 193, 214.

⁴ Trecker, *op. cit.*, pp. 144-149.

⁵ Johns and De Marche, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

munity organization process, (2) "agency-mindedness," (3) intra-agency barriers, such as lack of adequate communication between executive and staff, (4) stereotypes of other professionals and agencies, (5) ineffective machinery and structure for community co-ordination, (6) "too many meetings."

1. *Basic lack of knowledge of function of other agencies and of the principles of community organization.* Perhaps one reason why many staff members are unfamiliar with the precise nature of the services offered by other agencies which impinge on their work is that they are often unacquainted with many of their colleagues. Too often we wait for a crisis or some problem situation to develop before we arrange to meet with other agencies. In addition, some social workers may be unaware of the role of information and referral services, usually under community chest or welfare council auspices, with the result that agency members fail to obtain needed services—either because the worker did not know about their existence, or because it is just assumed that the other agency is overloaded to the extent that there is no use in referring someone.

2. *"Agency-mindedness."* Behind this characteristic are a host of rugged individualistic and isolationist survivals from an earlier period of social work. Agency needs are considered more important than community needs. Out of habit, inertia, or tradition, there is a lack of conviction regarding the need for co-operation with other agencies. Every community seems to have one or more such self-centered agencies. It is often expressed in an unwillingness to reach out and take the initiative in starting discussions regarding a commonly felt need or problem. Instead, such agencies fall back on their limitations and "function" rather than trying to see what can be done about a troublesome situation.

Other manifestations of an agency-centered orientation are the reluctance to share staff and board members for commu-

nity participation for fear of losing them, jurisdictional disputes, aggressive competition for funds and status, and the belief that one's own program of services is the most important and necessary one for the community. Often behind these vested interests are personality conflicts and professional jealousies, which are frequently the subject of "shoptalk" and gossip.

3. *Intra-agency barriers.* Another block to teamwork on an intra-agency level is the gap between the participation of the executive in community planning and the teamwork responsibilities of the staff. Because of failure in communication, high-sounding expressions of co-operation between agencies made at a committee meeting are not always translated into workable arrangements between staffs. Thus it will happen that a group worker may not know what to do when he finds that other agencies are providing services to various members of his group. Frequently there is no organized plan for the participation of the staff in working toward community teamwork, and no systematic passing on of information gained from such participation to all staff members.

4. *Stereotypes of other professionals and agencies.* These are among the most powerful obstacles to teamwork; they are truly barriers which are responsible for much of the lack of understanding and respect which is found in many communities. It is possible to note here only a few of the attitudes and feelings—one could almost call them prejudices—which are behind many of the failures to co-ordinate our community services effectively.

Because there are relatively few fully trained social workers practicing today, there tends to arise a certain snobbishness on the part of those who have completed their professional training, and an equivalent defensiveness by the untrained. Sometimes this is an almost unconscious feeling: that the other agency's workers are not "professional," that they cannot be trusted with "confidential" information, and that

Dynamics of Teamwork

they are somehow inadequate for their jobs. All this is reinforced because our profession is so young, and there are still no common standards or even an acceptable terminology which cuts across all fields of service.

We are dealing here with a whole series of tensions and conflicts which spring from differences in setting, auspices, practice, and training. These include feelings which workers in public agencies may have about voluntary agency staffs and vice versa; group workers versus recreation workers; caseworkers versus group workers; those who work with "normal" youngsters versus those who work with "problem" children. There is certainly a real need for us to understand and accept differences among ourselves as professional persons to the same extent that we try to do this with our clients or members.

5. *Ineffective machinery and structure for community co-ordination.* While all four of the preceding barriers to teamwork directly involve the agency and its staff, this fifth block to co-operative relationships is rooted in the community. There may not be a community chest, council of social agencies, or a community welfare council in the area—with the result that there is no one organization with a community point of view, one which is "neutral" and which can bring together the separate agencies on mutual problems. Thus, agencies shift for themselves and plan programs with little or no regard for the activities of other organizations. Or there may be a welfare council, but it provides no leadership—it is weak and not respected in the community. As a result, agencies start new programs or change existing ones without clearing with each other or the council. Why does this happen? Perhaps one explanation is that such a condition may reflect either an inadequate council staff, or more probably that the community itself is not yet convinced of the need for sound social planning since it tolerates this condition.

6. *"Too many meetings."* What is behind this perennial complaint? Going to

endless committee meetings is not in itself community planning or teamwork. Evidently many people do not have a creative, satisfying, or meaningful experience at meetings; they are often bored, impatient, or frustrated. One cause of dissatisfaction may be a lack of clarity regarding one's role and function. Responsible participation in meetings is based on knowing why one is present, as well as a commitment to and understanding of the group and community organization process. It is necessary to realize that all groups go through periods of confusion, lack of direction, and resistance to change. Social change is inevitably and annoyingly slow. The fact that productivity may be low at a meeting needs to be analyzed and not be a source of disgust. These and other principles derived from some of the recent findings of group dynamics should be better understood and accepted by all persons participating in committees involving teamwork.

OVERCOMING THESE OBSTACLES

First, the individual worker should assume the responsibility of *getting acquainted with other workers in the neighborhood or community* on an informal basis before a crisis or troublesome situation develops. This means that we must make a conscious and planned effort to rise out of our own agencies and their limited programs to become more familiar with our colleagues and the work of their agencies. From this it is but a step to consulting with other agencies on common problems, perhaps arranging a conference and then striving together for a more coherent pattern of services. Such efforts cannot help but improve and sharpen our own effectiveness.

A second responsibility of the worker would be to alert his agency to the importance of *formulating a community relations policy* if the agency does not have one. The preparation of such a policy should involve the participation of both board and staff members if it is to have

maximum utility. Among some of the major elements in a community relations policy as suggested by Harleigh Trecker,⁶ I would single out the following:

1. Identification with the community and its agencies, which is really a "state of mind" expressing positive and purposeful attitudes.

2. Assignment of representation of the agency to board and staff members to those community groups where there is a reason for participation.

3. Establishment of channels of communication between those who represent the agency and the rest of the board and staff with reporting back and clearance procedures carefully formulated.

4. Participation widely distributed and of a responsible kind, with agency representatives convinced of the worth of their participation and knowing how to take part in this process.

Third, workers should be concerned that their agency's *inservice training program includes a discussion of the work of other agencies, the community organization process, and how to participate in it effectively.* This needs to be done in a systematic, planned, and continuous way. This assumes that the agency has some responsibility for providing staff members with such information and orientation, and that it will be responsive to the requests of staff regarding the content of inservice training programs.

Probably the most effective, over-all way of overcoming any one or all six obstacles to teamwork is for workers to bring to the attention of their agencies the need to *strengthen the efforts of the central planning and co-ordinating body*, or to organize one if none is in existence. For a community welfare council, which is the primary organization of this type, is by its very nature dedicated to fostering teamwork among agencies and between agencies and the community. It is the unique instru-

ment which has evolved during the last thirty years to combat lack of knowledge of resources, "agency-mindedness," lack of communication, stereotypes, duplication, and outlived usefulness in the health, welfare, and recreation fields. If effective—and it is the responsibility of board, staff, and interested citizens to make it work—it can become a synonym for teamwork.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION CONSIDERATIONS

What should be done if there is no such council? The answer is to organize one. The existence of unmet needs is one of the most eloquent arguments for a planned and co-ordinated, community-wide approach through a welfare council structure. In a community without a council, an agency can either ignore unmet needs, complain about them, or do something about them. It can rarely meet the need itself, nor does it often have the skill, time, and basis for broad support to mobilize the community for such an effort. Consequently, it is suggested that under these circumstances agencies should seek to get together for the purpose of organizing a community welfare council.

We are saying once more that in order to discharge their full professional responsibility, direct-service agencies must not only carry out their programs of service, but must also undertake community organization responsibilities to a certain extent when they are confronted with unmet needs or lack of communication and co-ordination between agencies serving their area. Consequently, it is important for all staff members to know something about the community organization process, the necessary skills involved, and the role they should play. The whole matter of the provision of staff time for participation in community organization is actually an index to the agency's conviction of the relative importance of planning and co-

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 151.

Dynamics of Teamwork

ordinating its services in the community's interest.⁷

RATIONALE FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION

In this concluding section we shall apply our analysis of teamwork and some of its implications for community organization on the level of a neighborhood. What kind of structure and machinery is needed to bring a variety of services to people in a geographic area? Before answering this question, it is important to observe that the philosophy of most youth-serving agencies underscores the importance of neighborhood organization—of being close to the people served. Organizations such as the Scouts and other nonbuilding-centered agencies lay particular emphasis on the centrality of the home, the church, and the neighborhood. Building-centered agencies such as the "Y" are also concerned with the development of extension services so that programs can be brought closer to their constituency. Public recreation departments have been neighborhood-centered for many years.

Because the wide range of governmental and voluntary agency services are not always available in a neighborhood in a co-ordinated way, a variety of forms of neighborhood organization have been devised and used with varying degrees of success.⁸ Based on this experience, at least four related efforts are needed today to (1) make more services available; (2) develop integrated patterns of services to meet the

⁷ There are some special problems of participation faced by agencies that are not decentralized, or where excessive work loads prevent release of staff for committee service. Under these conditions, such agencies may have to be very selective by setting priorities and participate in those projects where their services are directly affected.

⁸ See Sidney Dillick, *Community Organization for Neighborhood Development—Past and Present* (New York: William Morrow & Company, 1953), for the best exposition of the background and principles of neighborhood organization for social welfare purposes.

varying needs of neighborhoods; (3) co-ordinate services to prevent overlapping and overlooking; (4) provide opportunities at the neighborhood level for people to form groups through which they can act together. "In carrying out these functions, the keynote must be the participation in these processes of people in their neighborhoods—where families live, shop, go to school and church, and where they vote."⁹

In line with this, there has been a renewed interest in establishing community centers to make available a variety of services under many auspices in the neighborhood. There has been a parallel development as the council of social agencies evolved into a community welfare council with district community councils. These district or neighborhood councils have facilitated citizen participation and have helped make available in the neighborhood the services of city-wide agencies. It is suggested here that the district or neighborhood community welfare council can provide certain values and principles which are necessary and valid not only in urban and metropolitan centers, but also for "problem" areas, suburban and rural communities. It is in a key and unique position to meet today's needs for neighborhood organization by: (1) co-ordinating health, welfare, and recreation services at the neighborhood level; (2) helping people become articulate about their needs and enlisting their participation in meeting them; (3) serving as a medium for interchange of ideas among rank and file professionals; (4) serving as a medium for joint planning and action by agencies and civic groups; (5) providing a means for communicating to the city-wide level the neighborhood view or problems.¹⁰

The district or neighborhood community council, as a co-ordinating, interorganizational body related functionally and staff-wise to an over-all community welfare

⁹ Dillick, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

council, is one of the principal means through which direct-service agencies and citizen organizations can work together within the larger context of a city or metropolitan area.¹¹ Indeed, in these days of growing suburban and satellite communities, extensive subdivisions of tract housing, this type of an approach to community organization is essential if programs are to get to the people who need them.

SOME SUGGESTED PATTERNS

For example, these new areas have some special problems involving identity and integration with the larger community, lack of adequate park and recreational space, including meeting places. They tend to contain a large concentration of families with growing children who can utilize and want a wide variety of health, welfare, and recreation services. How are we to get to them? The standard reply is in terms of "extension services," which implies a willingness and a capacity to take staff and services to the place where people live. Some agencies have been able to do this more effectively than others, particularly the national youth-serving organizations. There is a real need, though, for a pooling of resources among the agencies having a common interest in serving these subdivisions. Together they can more effectively promote adequate meeting facilities; through joint use of church, school, or home facilities more children can be served—if agencies are willing to share some of their resources. The problem of locating volunteer leadership is often a formidable one and it would seem to make sense for all agencies seeking volunteers to combine their efforts into one recruitment campaign. Similar campaigns for foster mothers or club leaders

have been most successful when developed on a joint-agency basis. This approach eliminates competitiveness and, because more people can be reached, results in a better caliber of volunteer leadership.

The same argument would hold for joint training of such leaders. This would require agreement as to the common-core basis for leadership, apart from the special information and knowledge needed in working with specific organizations. But even more important is the awareness of the type of organizational structure which would facilitate this type of co-operative planning and also acquaint the area with the existence of other community services. It is suggested that the organization of a district community welfare council is probably the most appropriate way of meeting these needs of new neighborhoods.

Many agencies have already organized neighborhood councils or advisory committees for their own programs. What is required is a neighborhood council for *all* groups serving the area. Experience has shown that this can best be done under the auspices of a community-wide organization such as a welfare council, rather than by any direct service agency.

SUMMARY

While it has become fashionable to espouse the principles of "teamwork," practice and advocacy have not always been related. Co-operative relationships have become even more necessary as a result of the growing complexity of social work practices. In analyzing the concept of teamwork, certain prerequisites and barriers were noted. Four specific suggestions to overcome such obstacles have been offered; this has implications for community organization, particularly on a neighborhood level. Decentralization of the machinery for planning and co-ordination is proposed as one of the major means of meeting today's need for teamwork in agencies and within the community.

¹¹ Cf. *A Geographical Approach to Community Planning* (New York: Community Chests and Councils of America, Inc.), a symposium based on papers from the 1951 National Conference of Social Work, for a description of current thinking on the role of neighborhood councils.

GROUP WORK SECTION

BY JACOB I. HURWITZ, Ph.D.

Systematizing Social Group Work Practice

THE TIME HAS come for an acceleration in the rate of professional development in the specialization of social group work. This calls, first and foremost, for a full and frank recognition, in practice as well as in theory, that direct service to clients is the primary function of the group worker, as it is of the caseworker, and that therefore the quality of this service must be considerably improved. As Dimock has put it so well, "Since the agency exists only to achieve certain objectives in the development of persons, the ultimate test of its value and effectiveness is in what happens to those who participate in the program."¹ And Coyle has recently expressed her disappointment over the prevailing tendency to move trained personnel too quickly into an administrative role, thus reducing the num-

ber of trained workers in close contact with practice and their concern with its quality.²

We submit that improving the quality of direct service to clients would advance significantly the stage of professional development of social group work. We suggest further that such an improvement in quality of service can be achieved in part by converting group work from a method³ guided largely by intuition into one which is methodologically sound, i.e., which conforms to the principles of orderly procedure. Some readers may contend that we are already overconcerned with methods and with professionalization in group work

¹ Hedley S. Dimock and Harleigh B. Trecker, *Supervision of Group Work and Recreation* (New York: Association Press, 1949), p. 240.

² Grace Longwell Coyle, "Proposed Areas for Concentration and Study," *The Group*, Vol. 17, No. 5 (June 1955), p. 8.

³ Group work is commonly characterized quite legitimately as a *process*. We prefer the term *method* because it points up more sharply the key function of the group worker—that of intervening in the group process in order to guide it toward psychologically and socially constructive goals.

JACOB I. HURWITZ is on the research and group work faculties of the University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work. He specialized in small group theory and research at the Research Center for Group Dynamics in Michigan.

EDITOR'S NOTE: This article and the four following it were chosen by the Publications Committees of the indicated Sections of NASW in accordance with a policy recommended by the TIAC Planning Committee and approved by the National Board.

JULY 1956

63

practice rather than with service to people and with social improvement. This is, however, a false dichotomy, for a methodologically sound practice makes for more effective service and greater social improvement.

A methodologically sound practice consists of:

1. Clearly defined, theoretically based goals representing the desired behavioral and attitudinal outcomes *formulated in specific and concrete terms.*

2. Determination, at intake and via early focused observation, of where the group and its members stand with respect to the stated goals.

3. Theoretically guided, systematic and clearly described efforts to bring them closer to the stated goals.

4. Continuous and focused observation of individual and group behavior along goal relevant dimensions.

5. Periodic appraisal of individual and group movement and feedback of results into the program planning process.

These five major steps in systematic practice should define the appropriate content of recording and guide supervisory efforts to improve worker performance.

Let us now spell out these rather generalized procedural suggestions in greater detail.

NEED FOR A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Although specific goals often guide group work practice, they are frequently implicit, hence uncommunicable to other practitioners. As a consequence no widely accepted *specific* goals exist in group work. This situation probably results, in part at least, from the fact that group work goals generally derive from empirical experience and are not related to tested theory. If group work is to become a theoretically rooted and illuminated field of practice, it must develop a conceptual framework to guide both practice and evaluation efforts.

The behavioral sciences, although still in the early stages of their development, can be of some assistance to group work in providing the beginnings of such a theoretical base for practice.

A sound conceptual framework can make an important contribution to the quality of group work practice by helping to provide a sharper focus to its efforts. A more highly focused practice can, in turn, aid the practitioner by:

1. Helping to formulate a widely acceptable set of desired behavioral and attitudinal outcomes (or goals) to guide both practice and efforts to evaluate it.

2. Suggesting what he must know at the outset about the individuals and groups⁴ with whom he works if he is to help them move closer to these goals. It thus helps to delineate the content of the intake interview and of the initial study process and thus provides a sounder basis for grouping.

3. Specifying what should be observed and recorded subsequently, thus lending more structure to the group worker's task and providing the data required to evaluate group work services.

4. Facilitating custom-made rather than prefabricated programming, thereby putting into practice the principles of "individualization" and of "beginning where the group is" instead of merely bowing low at their altar.

With the theoretically rooted goals properly defined, we must next consider the nature of the procedures used to reach them. These procedures constitute the heart of the group work method, as of any other method. It is therefore of some significance to observe that these procedures in group work are at a rather low level of

⁴ This applies particularly to group phenomena since trained group workers know considerably more about psychodynamics than about group dynamics. It is indeed strange that group workers, who "use the group to help the individual," know so comparatively little about the more recent findings with respect to characteristics of the groups they purport to use as tools.

development, in theory as well as in practice. What one finds in the literature (with a few noteworthy exceptions) is a fairly standard set of principles in the form of general prescriptions: "begin where the group is," "individualize the group," "the leader must make conscious use of self," and so on. But these principles, as they stand, are no more than slogans or perhaps general directives. Group work must operationalize its principles, *i.e.*, it must specify the procedures required to carry them out before they can serve as adequate guides to practice. Teaching students or new group leaders that they must "begin where the group is" without operationalizing this principle and then turning them loose to begin at this undefined point is confusing to the novice (traumatically so to many first-year students) and unfortunate for the group. "Where the group is" *with respect to what*, how a leader determines just where the group is with respect to each of these factors, what constitutes a beginning and to what specific ends he is making a beginning are but a few of the questions to which group work should provide clear answers.

The somewhat vague and general character of the group work method is of course predetermined by the nature of its goals. For, and let us state it candidly, many group workers commonly utilize intuitive, hit-or-miss, and unspecified methods in dealing with inadequately understood group situations in an effort to achieve undefined goals. It therefore should surprise no one that there should exist the oft-mentioned gap between available knowledge and skills and the prevailing level of practice. For although much knowledge and many skills are available, they have not been organized systematically, hence cannot be transmitted to group workers in a form that makes possible their effective utilization.

The failure to define group work goals with sufficient specificity may well have contributed to another methodologically

unsatisfactory feature of group work practice—its tendency to use a deductive, normative, and service-oriented approach to meeting the needs of clients. Group work literature is filled with analyses of the needs of age, sex, ethnic, and similar categories of people and with descriptions of attempts to meet these various needs. National organizations constantly send materials to their local constituent agencies to aid in programming for these categories of clients. Most agencies offer their clientele a fairly standardized set of services which experience has shown to be attractive to these various categories: preteens, the aging, teen-age girls, young adults, racially mixed groups, and so forth. This is all right. The trouble lies in what appears to be a common assumption—that all members of a given age or sex category are alike in their needs, and therefore an identical approach to meeting their needs can be used. Certainly group workers do not believe this statistically naive notion, but they frequently behave as though they did. For example, they often ask group leaders to use programming ideas determined *a priori* on the basis of normative data without foreknowledge of their suitability to particular groups.

To achieve their stated goals, group workers must introduce a more systematically client-oriented, inductive, and individualized approach to meeting the needs of their clientele. Group leaders must begin with a planned effort to become familiar with the relevant characteristics of their particular groups and members, relevance being defined, of course, by the specific outcomes they hope to produce. Armed with such a knowledge of individual and group needs, the group worker can then adopt or devise appropriate procedures to satisfy these needs and thus help to achieve progress toward the desired outcomes. In this way individualization can be converted from a slogan into a reality. Similarly, only when the nature of individual and group needs—or problems—is known, the objec-

tives specific and clear and the programmatic devices consciously selected to achieve these objectives, only then can group workers appropriately speak of the "use of program as a tool."

To illustrate the above points, let us consider the area of interracial programming. Standardized programs are often used by local agencies in their work with interracial groups. We submit that *whether* interracial programming should be introduced into a particular group and, if so, when, what kind and in what way, are decisions that can appropriately be made only by, or with the help of, someone familiar with that group. For how *particular* members of a majority and a minority group feel about their group memberships, how they relate to one another by virtue of these feelings, and how these relationships affect the leader's goals for the group are among the critical considerations in arriving at such decisions.

Such an inductive approach to practice has doubtless been utilized now and then by some group leaders. But it is a spotty and sporadic approach, a kind of happy accident found generally among perceptive and sensitive leaders. It is rarely, however, part of a total, systematic approach to practice, not even among such intuitively keen leaders.

The importance of study-based programming has of course been recognized by competent practitioners in the field. Most of them would doubtless accept as axiomatic that group workers should be thoroughly acquainted with the characteristics of their groups and should utilize this knowledge in working with them. Just how to go about achieving this thorough acquaintance and how to utilize it, however, has never been clearly spelled out in group work. Group leaders, virtually all of them untrained at that, are somehow expected to find the answers by themselves. To be sure, agency supervisors are sometimes available to help them, but these supervisors themselves have not been given

sufficient help in operationalizing this principle.

What is being suggested, then, is that a systematic and theoretically guided study process is perhaps the most effective device for operationalizing and thereby implementing the principles of group work, for such a process generates a logical and systematic relationship among goals, needs, and need-meeting techniques.

FUNCTION OF RECORDING

Recording, like programming, is often more of a ritual than an effective practice tool. Dimock and Trecker recognize this situation when they state that the value of records has been accepted, but the question remains as to what to put into them.⁵

Such a question would not arise were group work practice more systematic and theoretically guided. Specific goals suggest the kinds of psychosocial phenomena group leaders must observe if they wish to understand and help group members. In such a process, the group worker puts into his records the goal relevant behaviors he observes, the needs they reflect, what he does programmatically to satisfy the needs, and the observable results of his efforts.

Narrative process recording does not appear to be too well suited to the purposes listed above. This is partly because it is associated with what Riecken has called simple observation. In discussing the limitations of this type of observation, Riecken states that

... it is not clear just what the observer is observing, or whether he is paying attention to "important" things. In fact, under these conditions of observation, it is rarely possible to specify what the important events are or why the observer chose to note what he did. Neither he nor anyone else can tell, *because there has been no explicit frame of reference for observation* [author's italics]. He saw what happened to strike him, what his

⁵ Dimock and Trecker, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

VITZ: Systematizing Group Work Practice

this pre-existing values directed him to see or fail to see.⁶

While this picture is somewhat overdrawn for our purposes, it is certainly highly revealing and suggestive. For in the absence of such an explicit frame of reference for observation, group leaders tend to try to follow all the social processes as they occur in the group and to record their observations. What is required, however, is a more consciously focused and selective kind of observation guided by a theoretically rooted, goal-related set of observation categories. Group leaders must look for specific, predetermined phenomena rather than attempt the very difficult, wasteful, and confusing task of observing *all* individual and group behaviors. Such a focused approach to observation and recording should simplify the task of the group leader considerably, and at the same time increase his effectiveness.

- IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING - AND SUPERVISION

To develop the type of practice outlined above, group work class and field instructors and agency supervisors will have to place more emphasis in their training efforts on the art of systematic, theoretically guided practice. More of them will have to view group work practice—and teach it—as a scientific art, as do instructors in the more highly developed professions. This means, concretely, that more emphasis will have to be placed, both in schools and in the field, on what group workers should know about their particular members and groups (especially the latter) in order to meet their needs most effectively. It means, in addition, that this knowledge should be organized around a conceptual framework. It also means that group work will have to be taught with more of a diagnostic, problem-solving orientation. Classroom in-

struction will have to be integrated further with a formal and organized curriculum of field instruction. Students and group leaders will require more intensive training in observational skills to increase their ability to pick up behavioral clues to underlying individual and group dynamics. They will also need more skill in differentiating between facts and inferences in order to increase the likelihood that programming efforts will be based upon *accurate* appraisal of individual and group needs.

EVALUATION OF GROUP WORK SERVICES

Evaluation, although long considered an important element in practice, has been a relatively loose and subjective process. In recent years some serious attempts have been made to objectify and thereby tighten up this process.⁷ Important though these efforts were, they had one major limitation when viewed as potential tools in the hands of practitioners: they lacked an organic methodological link with the other aspects of practice. *For criteria, to be used effectively in evaluating services, must have been previously used to guide them.*⁸

Let us consider why this is so. One of the major professed purposes of group work is to help individuals achieve a greater measure of self-fulfillment and social adjustment. This constitutes an ultimate goal. What group workers actually attempt to do—or should—is to help these individuals acquire the concrete and specific knowledge, attitudes, behaviors, and skills which, taken together, make up a well-

⁷ See, for example, Grace Longwell Coyle, *Studies in Group Behavior* (New York: Association Press, 1937), Chapter I.

Elise Hatt Campbell, *Gauging Group Work* (Detroit: Board of Education, 1938).

American Camping Association, *Marks of Good Camping* (New York: Association Press, 1941).

Saul Bernstein, *Charting Group Progress* (New York: Association Press, 1949).

Gertrude Wilson, "Measurement and Evaluation of Social Group Work Practice," *The Social Welfare Forum*, 1952 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952).

⁶ Henry W. Riecken, *The Volunteer Work Camp: A Psychological Evaluation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., 1952), pp. 5-7.

adjusted and integrated personality. These specific, hoped-for outcomes constitute the subgoals of group work and as such serve as guides along the path toward the major and ultimate goals. *And it is these specific subgoals that make up the criteria used to evaluate service.*

Now, when specific subgoals are defined at the end of the group work process to serve as criteria for evaluation, rather than at the beginning so that they might also help to guide practice, the probability is rather high that insufficient direct factual evidence will be found in the group records to permit effective use of the criteria. And if such evidence is lacking, it is probably in part because group workers, lacking clear and explicit goals, cannot know precisely what to observe and record. It is also due, however, and perhaps more fundamentally, to the fact that a relatively un-goal-focused brand of practice is not likely to produce enough effects to be observed and recorded.

The proposal for improving the quality of service which we here advance would seem likely to increase effects measurably. And if what we look for, observe, do, and record are all systematically related and consciously goal-oriented, then our records should *ipso facto* provide the objective factual material necessary to measure these effects. For within the approach to practice outlined above, the evaluation process would entail the following major steps:

1. Identification with the aid of a conceptual framework of the desired specific outcomes or subgoals.

2. Determination of where the group and its members stand at the beginning with respect to each of these subgoals and the use of the findings as a basis for programming.

3. Determination of how far the group and its members have moved toward (or away from) these subgoals after a specified exposure to the above programming.

It is of course true that demonstrated movement toward goals cannot automatically be assumed to be the result of group work efforts for, as Bernstein has pointed

out, group work clients are subject to several other concurrent influences.⁸ This does not, however, mean, as Bernstein concluded, that we can measure only effects, not effectiveness, in group work. If we have a clear and detailed recorded description of the techniques used to influence group and member behavior, we can, through the use of a control group, demonstrate that relatively more (or less) movement has been produced in the former group by the known methods than in the control group, *subject to the same external influences*, by different but equally known methods.⁹ Riecken, in his excellent appraisal of a Quaker work camp, has pointed up the value and feasibility of using control groups in evaluation studies.¹⁰ And Maas, in his recent effort to develop a method for evaluating the individual, has demonstrated the applicability of this technique to group work.¹¹ To be sure, Maas is operating within the framework of group work research, not practice. It should be noted, though, that all the elements involved in evaluating service, save only the control group, can—and should—be an integral part of on-going practice. And even control groups can be used, in rudimentary form at least, by practitioners, as in comparing effects in a club group with those in a matched lounge group.

The mode of practice herein suggested would probably enable group workers to judge movement in their groups with about the same high degree of reliability as did Hunt's caseworkers with their clients.¹¹ And where research specialists are called in to do a more rigorous evaluation study, they should find their task vastly simpler

⁸ Bernstein, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

⁹ Riecken, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-14.

¹⁰ Henry S. Maas, "Evaluating the Individual Member in the Group," *Group Work and Community Organization 1953-1954* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), *passim*.

¹¹ J. McV. Hunt, Margaret Blenkner, and Leonard S. Kogan, *Testing Results in Social Casework: A Field Test of the Movement Scale* (New York: Family Service Association of America, 1950).

VITZ: *Systematizing Group Work Practice*

than did Riecken and Maas in their respective studies.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A conceptual framework, we believe, is the cornerstone upon which the entire structure of practice must rest. Individuals trained in the theory and methods of the behavioral sciences can help in the development of such a framework and thereby in systematizing and refining social group work practice. Practitioners do not, however, have to wait for such people to offer their services. That a systematic and theoretically guided type of practice can be initiated and executed by practitioners themselves has been demonstrated at the York Community House in Toronto.¹² The practice method utilized there might well serve as a model for group work agencies in this country.

GAINS FROM A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH

Some readers may brand such a proposal as visionary and unrealistic in light of the

¹² R. W. Bundy, "The Use of Group Work Method in the York Community House Project" (a mimeographed statement issued by the Neighborhood Workers Association, Toronto, 1954).

small proportion of trained workers in the field, the heavy demands on time and energy of available staff, and limitation in funds required to improve the situation. To such objections we can but point to the dynamic potentialities of such an approach to practice. A theoretically guided brand of practice makes possible that generalization from local situations through which a body of systematic theory (as against a "body of knowledge and skills") develops. This in turn makes possible not merely the "drawing from the behavioral sciences" so frequently recommended by group workers but a mutually enriching two-way channel of communication between group work and these sciences. Operationalizing goals makes possible the development of a communicable methodology which is a major distinguishing characteristic of any profession.¹³ A systematic theory and a communicable methodology lend more structure to practice and thus facilitate student teaching and in-service training of workers, particularly untrained workers. This in turn should make for a better quality of direct service to clients and thereby narrow the oft-lamented gap between theory and practice.

¹³ Abraham Flexner, "Is Social Work a Profession?" in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction* (Baltimore, 1915), p. 580.

MEDICAL SOCIAL WORK SECTION

BY JENNIE MOHR, Ph.D.

Research in a Medical Setting

SOCIAL SERVICE DEPARTMENTS in medical settings are continually and increasingly faced with many problems for which they must seek solutions. Caseworkers, supervisors, and administrators of social service departments in medical institutions are confronted, in the course of developing and carrying on their programs, with problems that pertain to all aspects of social work functioning in a medical setting, and at all levels of practical and theoretical concern. It is our purpose now to examine the role that research may have in helping to answer such questions, and to discuss how one may go about attempting to develop answers in one or two typical instances.

The questions are of two major types. The first includes questions about research itself. We are asked whether research is really necessary as a means of providing us with an understanding of various aspects of social work activity. Questions raised are: What purposes can research serve?

JENNIE MOHR is associate professor of social economy at the Simmons College School of Social Work, Boston, Massachusetts. This paper was presented at the 50th Anniversary of the Social Service Department, Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, in October 1955.

What kinds of research can be done, in relation to which questions? Who should do it, and in what context—is research a function of the social service department itself, or is it to be carried on in co-operation with other departments or personnel?

Questions of the second type have to do with some of the specific tasks which research might be expected to accomplish. Here we are asked how to select areas for research investigation, how such areas can be converted into "researchable" questions, and how to deal with certain specific methodological problems in carrying out research in the field of social work.

THE ROLE OF RESEARCH

The necessity for research lies in the fact that social workers are called on to make decisions about a great variety of situations. These decisions may relate to the carrying on of casework activity, to the evaluation of situations presented to the social worker by a patient or a client, to the solution of administrative problems, to the functions of the social worker in fields of teaching, consultation, or supervision, to the relationships of social workers to other professionals in the medical setting. Such de-

Social Work

Research in Medical Setting

cisions can be and often are made on the basis of empirical judgment rising out of experience. They are, however, given a quality of certainty by two factors: the systematic, objective, and accurate examination of the relevant facts, and the logical drawing of inferences, or making judgments about these facts, once they are known, on the basis of established principles of social work practice. It is the function of research to establish these facts, to show their significance in relation to the principles on which the practice of social work rests, and from an understanding of this relationship to draw logical inferences on the basis of which decisions for action can be made.

Research has been, correctly enough, identified with "the scientific approach" to problem-solving. But it shares with practice certain aspects of "scientific approach" to a problem. Two important aspects, as has been pointed out by Eleanor Cockerill, are *conceptualization* and *objectivity*. The validity of practice, like that of research, rests in part on the capacity of the social worker to see the individual instance not only as having certain unique characteristics, but also as having characteristics in common with other individual instances. It is only by virtue of this likeness that one can apply any principle of social work practice to any given case—one recognizes where it "fits." Secondly, one must view the situations in which one functions with as clear awareness as possible of the influences of one's own role as participant and of the impressions, anticipations, and predilections that might color one's view. Such requirements are common to research and practice.

One of the most important differences, however, lies in the immediate goals of research and of practice. Though both are engaged in problem-solving, the problems are very different in kind. For the caseworker the problem to be solved is something that stands in the way of adequate functioning or adjustment of an individual; there is an obstacle to be confronted and re-

moved; and thus the goal of practice is change. For the researcher, however, the problem is one of knowledge rather than of action. He does not aim to change anything, but rather to increase the knowledge and understanding on the basis of which action is directed toward change. Further, research *per se* never tells us what action *should* be taken; it tells us what we need to know in order to make such a decision. We often speak of research which is needed "in order to find out what is the best way of achieving our goal." Between the research and the action, however, lies the value judgment—the statement of what is desirable to be achieved, the statement of a goal for action. Research can give us the knowledge that good judgment requires, but it does not in itself determine the values to be held.

Although it is important to see clearly the distinction between the goal of research (the adding to our knowledge) and the goal of practice (the achievement of change), these two are not incompatible. The *final* goal of social work research is the attainment of the ends of social work practice through increased knowledge. Moreover, these goals may exist side by side in the same field of activity. This fact is attested to by many service-oriented research projects. But though service activities and research activities may accompany one another and may be aspects of the same endeavor, they must still be clearly distinguished. The relationship between these two functions in such a project is an important subject, but one that we cannot discuss here.

In examining the data of practice it is the primary function of research to look for uniformities in events. It is possible then to establish the relationship between the events and the general principles according to which they may be understood. This means that the researcher has two preliminary tasks. The first is to make as explicit as possible the underlying hypotheses, or hunches, or first guesses, that are the

basis for questions asked by the practitioner. The second is to specify as clearly as possible which aspects of a situation are relevant to the question under study, that is, what facts to observe. The complexities and subtleties of human behavior, a primary object of the social worker's concern, usually make it difficult to select out data that are actually relevant to a problem, both because one may not always know what is relevant, and because there is a pressing temptation to wander into areas that are "interesting" and "significant"—though not in relation to the problem immediately at hand.

But such selection is necessary. The purpose of research is to test out the correctness of our hypotheses; to enable us to follow out their implications when they are examined in the light of the actual events, such as the conditions, behavior, and attitudes, with which the social worker is faced. And further, and very importantly, research aims to amplify or modify these hypotheses, or to develop new ones, on the basis of increasingly precise knowledge.

KINDS OF RESEARCH

We are concerned here with the development of research that is oriented to a specific situation—the social work department in a medical setting. But though the areas of problems and the particular requirements for any given study are influenced by this fact, the principles of research involved are not different from those encountered elsewhere. Actually, different kinds of research are possible. Which kind we do at any point will depend on several factors, all related to the stage we have reached in our knowledge. The first factor is the degree of clarity and of specificity of the concepts we use in framing our hypothesis. Concepts that have been developed out of practice and experience may not always be clearly articulated and defined and, therefore, the ideas about them that we may attempt to verify may not

be precise. Secondly, we may not have sufficiently complete and systematic information about the material we want to investigate to enable us to identify and organize it adequately. Thirdly, we may not have developed suitable methods for dealing with a given type of problem. These elements, then, will influence the specific kind of research we can do in relation to any given problem.

We may identify here three kinds or levels of research that can be carried on, depending on the state of our knowledge and the adequacy of our research tools. We may need, first, to do research designed to discover and display the facts themselves. This is a descriptive kind of research which does not come out with the validation of an hypothesis, but provides a clearer understanding of the data that will lead to such validation—or invalidation. Secondly, we may do research in order to establish hypotheses which may then be tested out. Here we look for significant relationships and possible uniformities among the facts, and indicate what potential explanations we may suggest. This is an exploratory type of research, designed to propose hypotheses rather than to dispose of them. Thirdly, we may do research directed toward the testing out of an hypothesis; here we are concerned to look for causal relationships among facts, to evaluate results, and to measure achievement. I would like to call this evaluative research.

All these kinds of research are important. In the present state of research in the field of social work, and specifically in the field of casework, we are in great need of the first two in order to be able to develop the third. I think we have a tendency in this field to leap to the last-named before we are ready for it, and to devalue the research directed toward exploring and defining and clarifying ideas and data.

A consideration, then, of these two elements in research planning—the state of our knowledge about a given problem, and the type of research we are able to under-

Research in Medical Setting

take because of this state of knowledge—may be a guide to answering a question that must always be first in our thinking: Is this the appropriate time to undertake a given piece of research? The field of social work is full of important unanswered questions. We look to research to provide needed answers. But we must also ask ourselves whether a question can at the time be converted into one suitable for research, and what we can do with it.

WHO DOES RESEARCH IN SOCIAL WORK?

The question of who does research in social work is at times likely to evoke lively dispute and strong feelings. There is uppermost in the minds of many the dichotomy between those who know how to do research and those who know the field of social work. On the one hand, we are often told that caseworkers, by interest and training, are concerned with the individual client or patient and with the resolution of his particular difficulties, and do not want, and do not know how, to deal with the more abstract, impersonal, generalized inquiries of research. On the other hand, there is considerable conviction that the researcher coming to the field from the outside cannot evaluate and understand many of the crucial characteristics of social work practice itself. There is frequently the assumption that these two activities are in opposition to one another and that one must choose between them.

It is true that the activities of the researcher and the caseworker are different, and that they require different skills. But let us look at the question of incompatibility, and at the possibility of reconciling these activities. I believe not only that there are advantages to attempting such a reconciliation, but also that it is a necessity, and that social work research cannot flourish and be fruitful for practice unless some conjunction is achieved. It is only from those people who are engaged in the

field and who are aware of what needs to be known about it that we can expect appropriate, useful, and significant questions to come. But further, the kind of knowledge that makes the social worker the source of research problems also makes it important for her to be involved in the attempt to answer them. For one thing, the meaning of the data that are investigated can often be recognized only by people who are trained to understand them. For another, the nature of the data is such that without such knowledge one cannot always judge the suitability of applying one or another method of investigation to them. We often find the social worker involved in research projects in the role of interviewer, bringing reports to others concerned with their analysis and use, and providing information that others have specifically requested of her. I think, however, that the social worker should be involved not only in using her interviewing skills for obtaining data. She should be concerned in the total process of the research, from the planning stage on, including the design, observation, analysis, and writing. Unless the characteristic features and requirements of the field are considered in each of these steps, the research may suffer through distortion, bias, or the omission of significant facts. Analysis and interpretation may suffer from the unawareness of important elements that affect the use of specific methods or of the meaning of specific results.

It is, of course, equally true that many social workers have not developed research skills. Therefore, it is often very desirable, and indeed necessary, to draw on other disciplines for these skills, and for relevant research knowledge. One does not expect all caseworkers, for example, to be or to want to be skilled in research methods. But many are genuinely interested in the use of research, and some are genuinely interested in doing research. It is my belief that social work research can grow best when it grows from within the field itself. It is per-

fectly possible to use the help of people outside the field in doing it, but I think also that social workers can, if they wish, learn the necessary skills to do it themselves. The role of research in social work is developing, and if it draws sufficient interest from the professional workers, they will increasingly develop their own research skills.

SPECIFIC PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL WORK RESEARCH

We have up to now presented some general considerations of research which are as applicable to social work as they are to research in other fields; and we have commented on the role of the social worker in the research process. We have seen that social work research must grow out of social work needs, that it requires special skills, and that it may be performed on various levels. Let us now turn to some of the specific questions raised by social workers and some of the problems involved in applying to them the methods of research. We shall take as a basis for this consideration the enumeration of questions raised by social workers in the field which has been compiled by Addie Thomas.¹

These questions are, for the most part, of two kinds: questions concerning the function of social work, and specific questions about social work practice. It should be remembered, however, that these two areas of inquiry are not necessarily mutually exclusive. A question of social work practice, for example, may involve administrative problems related to how the practice can be established within the departmental functions. Conversely, one must be aware, in discussing social work function, of the appropriateness of our ideas to the actual operations in practice.

In attempting to apply to specific social work problems the general concepts of research method, it will be helpful to review briefly the steps of a research project. We

cannot here develop these steps in general discussion, but would hope to see their relevance to any specific study under consideration. They are as follows:

1. Converting a "problem" or an "area of interest" into a "researchable question." Interest in a situation which one does not fully understand and wishes to study must be made specific in terms of a particular question that can lend itself to detailed examination.

2. Stating the hypothesis to be explored, which is based on recognized principles within the field of social work.

3. Determining the sources of data.

4. Making systematic observations.

5. Organizing and analyzing the data.

6. Examining the hypothesis on the basis of the observations, drawing inferences and generalizations relating the observations to the hypothesis, and elucidating further hypotheses that may grow out of the study.

7. Presenting the finished product in communicable form.

RESEARCH RELATING TO SOCIAL WORK FUNCTION

Let us take, by way of illustration of a problem relating to social work function, the question, "What are the functions appropriate to a social work department in a medical setting?" This question arises out of the many demands made on the department for a variety of activities, such as casework, teaching, consultation, research, and conferences. All these activities must be integrated into the total program of the department if they are all found to be appropriate to it, and must be provided for in terms of social workers' time and effort as well as in terms of administrative procedures.

In attempting to define more precisely the problem to be studied, we must point out that it involves three things: (1) a statement of the goals of the department—the ends it wishes to achieve, (2) a statement of the activities that are actually carried

¹ Consultant on practice, Medical Social Work Section, NASW.

out in working toward these goals, and (3) an evaluation of the relationship between these two. It must further be seen that the term "function" may be taken in several ways. Thus, one must be clear at any point whether one is thinking of the "function" of the department in terms of the expectations people have of it and the demands that are made on it, or as the actual accomplishments that are achieved by social workers doing their job, or as activity considered to be "appropriate" to the department.

Let us look a little more in detail at these concepts of function. The expectations of and demands made on the department can be determined by observation of selected data. So, likewise, the actual accomplishments can be observed. The third aspect of function, however, involves a value judgment that lies outside the process of the research itself; decision as to "appropriateness" must be made in terms of principles or values on the basis of which the department is established and operates.

One must further note that all three aspects of the problem indicated here, *i.e.*, expectations, activities, and judgments of appropriateness may relate to a variety of specific functions. For example, the function of the department may be providing direct service to the patient, contributing to the understanding of the total-care treatment of the patient, working with other professions in terms of either direct or indirect service to patients, or carrying on certain community activities necessary to the hospital's program. There are undoubtedly many other functions that one could likewise enumerate. In setting up a research design, the various aspects of function indicated above would have to be considered in relation to all such specific functions that we might list.

Such considerations of the concept of function are necessary for making specific the subject under inquiry. The *statement of the hypothesis* then follows. This is the formulation of an expectation (which may be sustained or denied by the observations)

about certain behavior on the part of the staff in relation to the hospital, the department, and/or the patients. It should take into consideration all the aspects of function indicated, whether expressed as expectations or demands made on the social worker or as activities actually carried on. *Observations*, similarly, are then planned to disclose the facts relevant to these hypothetical expectations. This step involves the observation of each specified function, reported as an expectation or demand made on the department and observed as an activity of someone in the department. The final step of *evaluating the appropriateness* of these findings is a consideration of the observations in terms of the principles and values held by people; it is a process of making judgments which relate the facts thus revealed to past knowledge and experience.

One further point must be made about the level at which such a study might be carried on. The social work department would probably be concerned not only with what it is that the social workers do, but with the effectiveness of the specific methods which they use in carrying on their work. This matter of evaluating the effectiveness of activity, as distinct from describing the activities, is a further elaboration of the problem which may or may not be incorporated into the original project. Actually, it would be difficult to set up such a study of methods until one had a clear description of the activities themselves. But certainly it might be said that the methods employed in carrying out any of the assigned functions of the department would be important considerations in final judgments about the suitability of the functions to the goals of the department. This, however, is a subsequent consideration.

Three comments should be made about such a projected research: First, there are a number of considerations at the outset in determining whether such a piece of research would be suitable for a department to carry on at any given time, for example,

the pressures put on the department to do more things than there is time or staff to do; their own discontent with the program as it stands; the awareness of unsatisfied wants among those for whom the service is provided, and among those who provide it. Research is a response to such pressures. Secondly, it is important to stress that the answer to "what should be done" grows out of putting together the results of such explorations, which give both facts and suggestions for change through revealing lacks, incompleteness, over-provision of services, and other characteristics of the carrying out of function, with previously held values that might in fact be enhanced or modified by the results of the research. Thirdly, this particular problem illustrates well the relationship between research, administration, and practice.

RESEARCH RELATING TO CASEWORK PRACTICE

Illustrative of the problems concerning practice which have been raised for research consideration is the question, "How can the need for 100 percent medical-social review for any specific group of patients be determined on a really valid basis?" I am making the assumption here that in asking this question one is not merely asking the general question of whether the social worker should see every patient, but rather whether one can determine the extent to which the special conditions or requirements of certain groups of patients are such that a social evaluation at the beginning of treatment is important.

Obviously such a question involves matters not only of casework practice but of administration as well. I wish to discuss it, however, as a casework problem, on the assumption that if the casework aspects are clear, they will provide a basis on which to tackle the administrative aspects of the problem.

One could of course merely say, "Try it and see what happens." But such pro-

cedure would probably not be very fruitful unless one could systematically identify "what happens." One must therefore first set up some questions about what kinds of "happenings" one would look for, in which group or groups of patients they are believed to be significant, and in relation to what aspects of medical-social problems.

Such a statement of the research problem assumes two possibilities (neither of which is necessarily correct): (1) that all patients, or all within certain classes, experience difficulties that affect the course of recovery and are within the areas suitable for casework practice; (2) that the specific character of these difficulties can be assessed for specific groups of patients.

Such a study, like any other, would need to begin with hypotheses growing out of past experience. Here again I am indebted to Miss Thomas for raising the questions from which hypotheses may be developed. One might, for purposes of illustration only, list a few of the ideas, provided by past experience, that could furnish such hypotheses:

1. There are implications, specific to the particular disease, for acceptance by the patient of the diagnosis and the need for treatment.

2. The patient's family life, and the lives of others in the family, may be significantly affected by the presence of the illness or by the requirements of the treatment.

3. The extent and ways in which the patient and his family can accommodate themselves to the demands of the illness are significantly affected by the family or social conditions in which the patient lives. (This is the reverse of the preceding assumption.)

4. There are differentials in the modes of responding to the illness according to its stage or severity, specific type, slowness of the recovery process, or other particular aspect of the course of illness and recovery.

5. The preceding social factors may have specific influence on medical factors

Research in Medical Setting

involved in the process of the disease and the care of the patient.

At this early stage in the consideration of a study, when we are attempting to formulate some hypothetical conditions to explore, one may well raise the question (which is always relevant at an early stage) of whether we are yet ready for systematic research. If hypotheses, such as are indicated above, are not clearly determinable, we may need to consider a preliminary exploration first. Such exploration would not be very systematic, but would lead to the more systematic organization of hypotheses and the selection of both specific questions and specific cases for study. Whether such preliminary study is needed must be decided on the basis of how precise our knowledge and thinking has been up to this point.

"Trying it out to see what happens" then assumes the form of establishing a framework within which one examines the operation of 100 percent review. Such examination gives precise information in terms of who the patients are, the circumstances of illness, and the types of medical-social problems revealed.

Such a study might assume various aspects. One would need to decide which to start with, and how many might be explored in a single project. Thus, any of the hypotheses of the type suggested above might be pursued in relation to the following aspects of medical-social review. These are again only by way of illustration, and not meant in any degree to exhaust the possibilities:

The discovery at time of admission of

social problems that might impede the patient's recovery.

A follow-up study to assess the effectiveness of early casework help.

Differential diagnoses of problems and of kinds of help needed in terms of particular conditions of the disease, severity of the disability, social and family circumstances of the patient, and other social-medical factors.

This consideration of the problem of 100 percent review merely illustrates different ways in which a study might be focused. The important point to consider is that some systematic way of describing the social factors important in medical-social treatment must be set up; and that one should base a study, also, on a systematic selection of patients. Then one will be in a position to make some inferences concerning the relationship between medical circumstances, social needs, and casework exploration and treatment.

The foregoing discussion attempts two things: a presentation of some of the basic concepts of research method essential to the process of solving certain types of social work problems, and illustrations of how this method may be applied to specific questions. The application of research methods to the field of social work in a medical setting is a challenge to both the researcher and the practicing social worker. It is most successful when each is aware of, responsive to, and in some measure involved in the work of the other. Together they can find profit, in the field of social work and in the use of techniques that have proved fruitful in clarifying our understanding and extending our knowledge.

PSYCHIATRIC SOCIAL WORK SECTION

BY LESTER PEDDY

Clinicians in the School

THE IMPORTANCE OF co-operation between school and agency is freely acknowledged. Yet I think we must face squarely the fact that communications between clinic and agency staffs and school people are not good—in many instances they are notoriously bad. Generally, they tend to be guarded, fragmentary, and reluctant. It seems to us that the impediments to freer communication and co-operation stem from a compounding of unsound preconceptions, misunderstandings, institutional and personal anxieties, and vested interests. These create barriers to effective communications and improved co-operation toward a common end.

This paper discusses some of these problems as they affect working relationships between educators and clinicians or agency people. The opinions expressed derive largely from the experience of the Three Schools Project, operating in New York City since December 1949.

LESTER PEDDY is co-ordinator of the Three Schools Project, which was conceived by the New York City Youth Board in co-operation with the New York City Board of Education, Division of Child Welfare. Financial support for this project was furnished by the Youth Board until June 30, 1955, when this responsibility was assumed by the New York City Community Mental Health Board.

THREE SCHOOLS PROJECT

The project was organized as part of a plan to assay the effects of full-time clinical treatment service physically located within a school building. Full-time clinics were set up in an elementary school (pupil population approximately 1,200), a junior high school (pupil population 1,400), and a senior high school (pupil population 2,300).¹ The basic unit in each school includes a supervisor, a social worker of long experience charged with administrative responsibility for the unit, three or four psychiatric social workers, one or two psychologists, and necessary clerical personnel. The junior high school unit includes a vocational guidance counselor; the senior high school includes a vocational guidance worker and an employment placement worker. In addition to this full-time staff, each unit has two part-time psychiatrists who, between them, give from twenty to twenty-eight hours weekly. Each unit is licensed as a psychiatric clinic by the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene.

Intake is limited to students who attend the school in which the unit is located; their parents may be seen for shorter or

¹ Public School 42; Clark Junior High School, P.S. 37; Morris High School—all in the Bronx, New York City.

Clinicians in the School

longer periods, largely in relation to the youngsters' problems. The units offer the usual range of child guidance services. Referrals originate largely with teachers or other school personnel. Since the inception of the project the clinics have given direct service to more than 3,000 youngsters.

It is obvious that the setting and organizational structure within which we operate are considerably different from that of most clinical or agency services. We shall not spell out here the special advantages we believe flow from our structure; suffice it to note that our experience has convinced us that the positives, real and potential, in such a setting far outweigh any handicapping elements.

What we have in common with extra-school based services is the necessity for communicating with and interpreting to school people. We too have the need to gain acceptance for our professional services and to elicit co-operation from the school. We differ from extra-school services in this respect in degree rather than in kind. Because the need for such constructive relationships is fundamental to our whole operation, we have probably devoted more thought, attention, and effort to these problems than the community agency has been able to or found necessary. Thus, our experience may be viewed as a kind of testing ground for school-agency relationships—a sort of laboratory in which these questions might be studied in something more nearly approaching "pure culture."

ATTITUDES OF CLINIC STAFF

Although intellectually we recognize that, as in any other group, there is considerable qualitative unevenness among teachers, in practice and in our own thinking we must be careful to avoid lumping them together. Too often we tend to judge teachers as a group by the poorest among them, while at the same time we judge our own competence by the level of the best we produce. There is too great a readiness to assume unquestioned competence in our own group

while maintaining a considerable skepticism about other disciplines. This may well be related to anxiety aroused by a critical examination of our own practice or level of performance.

Our attitudes toward school and what we feel it represents bear directly on our effectiveness in working with school people. We have seen long-banked emotional fires flare up when a staff member, after many years in other settings, returns to a school. Teachers have been invested with the same air of all-knowing beneficence or embroidered with the same set of horns and tails they were given when our clinician was a student.

We have encountered a number of instances in which the clinician obviously saw his function as "protecting" the child from a malevolent school determined to inflict the same punishments and sufferings as it apparently did to our staff member. Too often, in the early days, we erred in projecting our feelings about the school situation on to youngsters we were trying to help.

In extreme form we saw this developed in a staff member who was frank enough to say that she could not honestly try to help youngsters return to school because she felt the school was not good for children. Of course, she cited most of the negatives that one could enumerate about almost any school and managed to overlook all of the positives that even poorer schools have to offer.

This attitude is also apparent in the tendency to cite a destructive action of a notoriously poor teacher as though it were typical of all teachers. I remember vividly an instance in which there was reported to me a flagrant violation by a school of an understanding arrived at a few days earlier. Since considerable time and effort had gone into spelling out this agreement, certainly vexation and indignation were appropriate reactions. What was most disturbing about the affair was that the report was transmitted with an undertone of cynically tri-

umphant glee, which said in effect, "This *proves* you can't work with this school."

Clinicians are guests in the school, but a very special kind of guest. We need to remind ourselves of this from time to time. We need to see our contribution in its true perspective: an important service which can be extremely helpful to pupil and school. Sometimes our temerity has done us a disservice. In our eagerness to avoid what we feared might be aggressiveness and consequent nonacceptance, we may have diluted our professionalism; we may have been backward in presenting ourselves and our services in a reasonably determined and confident fashion.

The point here is to avoid the error that we often see in the student or beginning clinical worker. Based on a failure really to grasp the concept of a functional therapeutic relationship, the inexperienced worker may go to all sorts of extremes to gain the "acceptance" of the patient—on the patient's terms. He may tell you he does it to get the patient to "like" him. We recognize this as a function of his insecurity; the resultant "relationship" inevitably augurs trouble for the continuing treatment process.

Overlooking the professional and purposive basis of the relationship in favor of getting the school to "like" us also spells trouble ahead. We need to be genuinely convinced of our own professional validity, keep its core intact, and test our relationships against the yardstick of professional purposiveness. The alternative is a confusion which will likely frustrate both clinical and educational aims.

REFERRAL PROCEDURES

From the beginning we were committed to the idea that teachers (and students) should have free and easy access to our service. Much of our original planning was premised on the principle that mechanical or procedural barriers between ourselves and the teachers would tend to limit the use made of our service. Referral forms asked

for the barest minimum of information: identifying data, the teacher's description of the child's behavior or problem, and efforts already made by the school to meet the problem.

Referrals are followed through in some detail with the referring teacher. This offers a first opportunity for meaningful contact with individual teachers and represents an earnest of our interest and understanding. It offers, too, opportunity for further interpretation of our service, and to achieve some understanding of the student's problem and the teacher's problem with the student as she sees it. It has the potential for beginning involvement of the teacher in joint planning. Of course, not all these elements may enter into one or even a series of early contacts, but awareness of these possibilities makes their exploitation more likely. Sometimes all that might be feasible is a tactful discussion of a patently inappropriate referral.

Over the years, as we have felt ourselves better understood and accepted, we have introduced modifications of the referral procedure. In one school we suggested that most referrals be screened through the school guidance department or grade advisors. We made these suggestions confident of the professional strengths of these school people. Discussion of referrals between grade (or guidance) advisors and the referring teacher presents the possibility for teacher development, for improved school planning for a youngster, and sharpened teacher understanding as to what is appropriately a clinical responsibility as opposed to a school responsibility. This procedure has improved the quality of referrals made.

However, we continue to permit free, direct access to us by any teacher. The changed procedure is optional and we encourage its use but we are reluctant to introduce anything which might be construed by the teacher as a deterrent to making a referral which she feels is indicated.

In all the schools pupils are free to approach the clinic directly, without any

Clinicians in the School

school intermediary, for consultation or other help. The number of self-referrals has reached significant proportions only in the high school; some 26 percent of our high school cases have been self-referrals. A good proportion of these are requests for vocational guidance. On closer examination, some of this group turn out to be not-too-carefully disguised requests for personal help.

TEACHERS' ATTITUDES

The most significant area in the development of our relationship with the school is the day-to-day contact with the teachers. Since we have been in the position of trying to convince others of the value of our wares, we have assumed a large measure of the initiative for establishing and maintaining effective liaison.

As we have grown in our understanding of the individual teacher and in our understanding of the general problems of teachers, we have been able to use ourselves to better purpose in the schools. Some appreciation of the numerous problems that the teacher faces has given us greater insight and sympathy in relating to them as a group and as individuals. Overcrowded classes, little or no free time during a pressure-filled day, and a feeling that excessive demands are being made of them (and of schools in general) are characteristic of large numbers of teachers.

Many teachers feel threatened by our service and contact with us. (We do not propose here to conjecture on the deeper unconscious reactions contact with our service may stimulate in the teacher.) They tend to see us as interlopers, determined to emphasize their shortcomings, perhaps to expose them as incompetents, or at least to tell them how to run their affairs. Teachers of many years' experience resent what they consider an "alien group" forcing itself on them and attempting to "impose" ideas and procedures which, by implication at least, may be critical of their long-established practices. When, in our

arrogance, we have made the error of implying a "magic" formula with quick and easy solutions to problems with which they have been wrestling for many years, the teacher is understandably resentful and suspicious. These sentiments are solidified when the "magic" fails, as it must.

The teacher's anxiety—and hostility—may come through to us not only in the relatively crude form of making almost no referrals or of failing to keep appointments with us, but within the context of seeming co-operation. There are expressions of impatience over the slowness of our procedures, direct expressions of skepticism of our effectiveness, frequent reiteration that "All Johnny needs is a few good beatings," or "Somebody should go into that family and straighten them out." We hear, too, that "Teachers could do the same job you people do if they had enough time to spend with each child." Then there is the more subtle negativism in which referral of an extremely disturbed child—long known to the teacher—is made well after the optimal period; here the teacher is defying us to "do something" with a situation she is convinced is hopeless.

In dealing with teachers' anxieties we have been greatly impressed by a feeling found among the more skilled and conscientious teachers. One summed it up when she said: "I'm a teacher and it's my job to teach. If these kids don't learn I somehow feel that it's my fault. I'm falling down on the job." This attitude may be seen even in situations involving extremely disturbed children whose preoccupation with personal problems pretty much precludes their giving any significant portion of their energy to academic learning.

During the course of their training all teachers have had courses in developmental psychology and mental hygiene principles. Almost all of them have at least an intellectual understanding of some basic principles of interpersonal relations. Many have an intuitively sensitive ability to develop constructive relationships with students.

However, out of a combination of repeated frustrations, insufficient understanding, or inability to translate concepts into practice, many teachers have developed an armor of skepticism or indifference. Repeated inability to obtain necessary services, or to achieve appreciable results despite heavy efforts, has resulted in an attitude which dictates avoidance of involvement.

WORKING WITH TEACHERS

Much of our work with teachers has been oriented toward activating or reactivating a constructive personal involvement of teachers with the youngsters who have shown special difficulties in the classroom. We feel that with many teachers we have achieved a fair measure of success. This is due primarily to the continuing day-to-day contact we have had with them in connection with individual children who may be causing them anxiety or difficulty.

We find that we have been most helpful to child and teacher alike when we are able to help the teacher personalize the child, when we can offer added understanding of problems the child is struggling with and sometimes suggestions as to how all of us can be helpful to him—and incidentally, to the teacher. When we are able to add a new dimension to the teacher's understanding of the pupil, progress usually ensues.

Sometimes this may be a relatively simple matter: more sharing of new information will drastically alter the teacher's perspective toward a child. Other situations are less simple: they may involve dealing with some of the teacher's own anxieties, aroused by a particular student or his behavior; they may require repeated, persistent, and small doses of interpretation, suggestion, and support.

We have from time to time (and we continue to do so) met with groups of teachers, or an entire faculty for interpretation of our services. But, to paraphrase, "One good case conference is worth 1,000 words." Our experience parallels that reported by

Prescott based on his many years of experience in orienting teachers to mental hygiene perspectives. . . . "The lecture process (is) extremely ineffective. . . . We must help (teachers) examine the causation that underlies the behavior of the flesh and blood children with whom they have responsible day-to-day contact."²

Carefully planned, detailed discussions of individual children, the particular problems they present, and outlining of approaches to meet these problems are the keystone upon which our service rests. This must include a free interchange of information, with the teacher keeping the clinic abreast of developments and vice versa. Whenever possible, participation in the planning and a role in the plan is given to the teacher. At intervals developments are reviewed and modifications that seem indicated are made. We cannot overstress the importance of involving school people in planning.

We invite some teachers to our clinical conferences. We welcome their observations and their professional insights. We are especially appreciative of the help they give us by their constant reminder that we are planning for a youngster who will be functioning in a classroom situation.

I am reminded of a case conference in which a school administrator limited his role to that of observer. Among other plans, our team considered and then rejected the recommendation that a youngster be promoted to a higher grade. Our educator sighed with incredulous relief. He had been convinced that promotion would be unwise and had uncomfortably resolved to exercise his prerogative to refuse such a request, although, as he confessed, he was not sure that he could have stood up to the "concerted onslaught" of the whole clinic. It became clear he considered that we regularly and unthoughtfully made

² D. Prescott, in *Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference of Clinical Personnel* (Albany, N. Y.: New York State Mental Health Commission, 1953), p. 28.

recommendations for promotions because we were "just plain softies." Following this incident such recommendations as we did make for program changes in this school received prompt and favorable action.

One of the greatest sources of on-the-job satisfaction comes when, through discussion of a particular child over a period of time, we are able to effect a change in the teacher's attitude which is reflected not only in his relationship to our patient, but also in a more sensitive understanding of other pupils. We appreciate that, realistically, we cannot reach directly all children in our schools who might be able to use our help—there is currently a waiting list in each unit. The carryover effect to other pupils will hopefully enable teachers to handle more effectively those children who probably never would have come to our attention in any event. Teachers will continue to be in contact with many more children than we can possibly reach. In this fashion we are able to inject a significant preventive or ameliorative element into our contribution to the school.

It has become increasingly obvious that the very presence of our service—with its easy accessibility—has had a helpful, relaxing, and encouraging effect on many teachers. As one teacher put it, with our group in a school, "It's no longer like butting your head against a stone wall. I know I have allies in the school. Most kids I can handle without any help but I know very well that if I hadn't the assurance of being able to turn to you people for help if I needed it, I would have avoided getting involved. Too many times I've wound up with a mess of my own making on my hands."

TYPE OF REFERRALS

The nature of our developing relationship to school personnel has been reflected in another significant area: the type of referrals sent to us. A number of studies over the past twenty-five years consistently suggest differences in what clinicians and

teachers see as maladjustment.³ Ullman (1952) summed up these findings as follows: "Items on which teachers and clinicians differed tended to be those . . . items referring to home or social relationships, preferences for associating with a different age group, nonfeasant hostility or passive resistance, and intrapsychic or 'worry-items.' Teachers felt quite plainly that politeness and obedience were characteristic of good adjustment while clinicians felt that the significance of these items for adjustment was equivocal."⁴

Our early experience particularly witnessed a rather wide disparity in criteria for identifying children who needed help. More significant to us, however, has been the gradual change in the range of problems referred to us. Initially, the overwhelming bulk of the pupils sent to us were those presenting overt behavior problems of fairly long standing. Figuring prominently in our early referrals were such reasons as "truancy," "antisocial behavior—always fighting," "sudden outbursts—poor control," and "disturbed—upsets class routine—obscene sex play." They were referred to us with some hope for miraculous cure, but more realistically in anticipation of some kind of administrative disposition so as, to quote one principal, "to get them out of our hair."

Over the years we have seen an increased variety in the reasons for referral. There seems to be an absolute reduction in the number of overt behavior referrals and we now see more youngsters referred for such reasons as "inability to concentrate—day dreams," "lack of reaction to things," and "beginning to truant, keeps to himself

³ E. K. Wickman, *Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes* (New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1928).

C. R. Rogers, "The Criteria Used in a Study of Mental Health Problems," *Education Research Bulletin*, Vol. 21 (1942), pp. 69-79. Cited by Ullman.

C. E. Ullman, *Identification of Maladjusted School Children*, Public Health Monograph No. 7 (Washington: Federal Security Agency, 1952).

⁴ Ullman, *op. cit.*

and sits in movies daily." ⁵ Included within this group is a fair proportion of children whose classwork is passing and whose general behavior in school is well within the limits of acceptable deportment.

This suggests not only a rapprochement of clinical and educational thinking in these schools but, more important, it suggests the capacity, interest and willingness of teachers to broaden their point of view in assaying a child's needs. It underlines the opportunities for effective collaboration between clinicians and sensitive, aware, and interested school people.

KEY ROLE OF SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

We have been strikingly impressed by the key role of the principal in setting and maintaining the psychological climate of the school.

As a group, teachers are sensitively attuned to the principal's attitude. They seem quick to detect his interests and emphases and to react in conformity with them; the well-structured hierarchical organization of school systems seems to promote this. They are quick to gather when a principal is closely related to our service, when he takes a genuine interest in our activities, and when he shows by his own words and actions that he sees our service as a significant asset to the school and its pupils. Obviously this cannot create understanding or sympathy where it does not exist, nor can it eliminate hostility or antagonism which already exists. What the co-operative principal does so well is help prepare an atmosphere which promotes teacher-clinician mutuality rather than one which exacerbates existing or potential frictions. He encourages and strengthens those

teachers who are interested in applying a constructive mental hygiene approach to their work. His attitude tends to minimize overt nonco-operation; but of course, it has little real effect on those teachers whose severe resistance to us arises largely out of their own anxieties and who respond with fear and hostility—sometimes quite unrestrained and undisguised. It may occasionally channel these feelings into more subtle modes of expression, but this may be a dubious blessing.

Functional integration with the school setting is one of our professed aims. We stress the functional aspect rather than formal administrative integration; we have considerable reservations about the wisdom of organic integration of our clinics with the actual structure of the school within which we are located.

DIFFERENCE IN ORIENTATION

This opinion stems largely from what we see as a major difference in the philosophic orientations of the clinician and educator. The clinician's emphasis is on the youngster with whom the direct relationship is established; effort is directed toward working within the context of all his relationships, in and out of school, in and out of the family setting, evaluated as they impinge on his total adjustment. The "patient," as opposed to the "pupil," is not considered primarily within the framework of the school.

The educator does not gainsay the importance of individualizing the child. His frame of reference, however, tends to be different from that of the clinician. The educator inevitably sees the youngster as part of the class or school and thinks largely in terms of the youngster's adjustment within the educational environment. The educator, too, assumes responsibility for a large group of children simultaneously, and must perforce devote his major effort to the group as a whole.

Highly oversimplified, this may be restated: the educator thinks first of the

⁵ Elements of at least several factors seem involved in this: (a) The clinics have processed the accumulated backlog of such cases. (b) Earlier referrals have prevented many situations from deteriorating to extremes. (c) The lessened preoccupation of school personnel with a relatively small number of children has freed them for increased effectiveness with the rest of the student group.

Clinicians in the School

school as a whole and then of the particular child; the clinician's order of emphasis is likely to be the reverse. Perhaps this is as it should be; certainly the hope is that a proper balance may be struck between the needs of the individual student and the student group as a whole. Given these opposing pressures it may be that we can come closer to the happy medium.

ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIP

We are convinced of the necessity for our administrative separateness from the local school administration because we have had a fair amount of experience with subtle and overt pressure from school principals who are interested in shifting the focus of our service. Much of this derives from their preoccupying interest with the overall operation of the school—from the educator's special point of view. On a number of occasions there have been requests by principals that we undertake special studies or responsibilities, geared toward throwing light on certain school problems. We have had no question of the validity of these problems and their significance for school administration but we had grave reservations as to whether handling these problems was properly within our function. Most of these projects could be carried out only at the cost of blunting or redirecting our clinical service.

Some principals have made it clear that they see running a school as a full-time job and are not interested (nor do they feel themselves equipped) to take responsibility for the direction of clinical service. They have made it clear, by word and by deed, that they are prepared to co-operate with us, to achieve the maximum help for their schools that we are able to offer.

Because our service is ancillary to the school's primary mission of education, we try, wherever possible, to work through existing channels within the school's organizational structure. We try to avoid responsibility for children whose problem is essentially educational; we believe that, other than on a consultative level, we

should not be involved with a child until the school has exhausted its normal resources, or unless it is quickly apparent that the school's usual resources cannot cope with the problem.

Despite our peripheral relationship to the formal school structure some principals have taken the initiative to draw us closer to the planning function in school. For example, in one school a representative of the clinic is a regular member of the school's administrative council which reviews and plans intra-school program and policy; in another school a clinic representative is invited to attend council meetings when items of special interest to us appear on the agenda. In one of our schools the principal has consulted us on the matter of the assignment of certain teachers to specialized jobs within the school. In the same school a department chairman is working closely with us in planning the introduction of mental hygiene concepts into the curriculum on a more structured basis.

One understanding and co-operative principal said to us, "You people help us with many problems but you also create plenty for us." He went on to explain that the spur of our presence stimulated new and more intensive activity on the part of many teachers. The greater individualization of children that results from this multiplies the pressures on the school administration. There are requests for program adjustments, special course planning for an increased number of children, "unusual" arrangements of one type or another for exceptional children. There are likely to be difficulties, too, created by teachers who object to or would not co-operate with our service and there are, perhaps, forceful demands for attention to aspects of the school's operation that might have gone unnoticed or unattended.

He concluded, "You've helped us with a lot of headaches, and you've given us others. But if you keep prodding us and we keep prodding you, together we can do a whale of a job for children."

SCHOOL SOCIAL WORK SECTION

BY SANDRA D. ARBIT

Working with Parents

ALTHOUGH THE FIELD of school social work has existed for several decades, it can still be regarded as a "frontier area" of social work—partially uncharted ground, both for those who work in it and those in other professions who work with it. Mute evidence for this statement is the wide variation of understanding among educators and parents of what a school social worker's function is. It is disturbing to find how often the workers themselves show confusion about their function. As in all relatively new and partially understood areas of endeavor, workers must be flexible and attempt to use their skills in the ways best designed to meet the needs of those they serve. But such flexibility must be founded upon very clear understanding in the workers themselves of their goals, and the methods they will use to attain these goals.

One area of confusion is that of the school social worker's contacts with the parents of the child who needs help. Certainly we see considerable difference in the ideas of social workers and educators about

the role the worker is to play here. In some cases, conflict arises where it appears that the social worker is usurping the traditional role of the teacher by discussing a child's academic progress with parents. In other cases, the social worker is in conflict about the school's request that he make home visits to "find out what goes on in Johnny's home that makes him act this way."

Questions like these involve the area of the worker's function in relation to the functions of other school personnel. They can best be summed up under the heading of "Who will do what with whom?" They are usually resolved by considering the traditions existing in each school community, how successful former practices have been, how the social worker can fit himself into the existing structure of practice, and so on, and with willingness and ability to be flexible on the part of all concerned.

SIZE OF THE CASE LOAD

This article is more concerned with the question of the worker's relationship with the parents than that of relationships within the school. We shall confine our

SANDRA D. ARBIT was formerly a member of the Institute for Juvenile Research, Department of Public Welfare, Champaign, Illinois.

Working with Parents

thinking here to the parents of elementary school children referred for service. This will omit the topic of working with parents of adolescents who are so engaged in the painful process of emancipation from their parents that it is often possible and sometimes desirable to omit parent interviews.

The questions before us are whether or not to interview parents; what should be the purpose of, and content discussed in interviews; and how many should be held. Great flexibility is also required in deciding these questions on the basis of the needs of the individual case; however, it often seems that this is not the basis used in deciding what to do about parent interviews. All too common practice is to base decisions upon the size of the worker's case load and consequent limitations of his time. This illustrates perfectly the well-known error of "putting the cart before the horse." It is the time *required* truly to help children and their parents that should determine the size of a case load, rather than the size of the load determining amount of service given.

Obviously, when workers accept all cases referred to them until almost all their school hours are filled, they have very little time to interview parents. They must then pretty well confine their work to individual casework interviews with the child, usually consisting of one-half hour per week. In these sessions the worker's goal is twofold: (1) to learn about the various factors causing the child to have difficulty academically and/or behaviorally, and (2) to help him deal differently with these factors so that his functioning in school will improve. Is it possible to achieve this goal with elementary school age children without seeing their parents? Certainly it is accomplished in some cases, but just as certainly these cases are rare and often involve the worker's serving the child for very long periods of time; usually several years. In the great majority of cases, this goal cannot be successfully accomplished without involving the parents.

LEARNING ABOUT THE CHILD

Let us look more closely at the two parts of the worker's objective: Can we learn all we need to know about the reasons behind a child's school difficulties without talking with the parents? We can learn from the principal and teachers what his work habits, achievement, and school behavior have been like. From the child we can learn what he thinks are causes for his difficulties, both from his verbalizations and his play. And always we add our own observations of him. We can then draw our conclusions by integrating what we have learned from these three sources of information and impressions. (It hardly needs to be pointed out how careful we must be to keep our conclusions tentative because of the possibility of error or misunderstanding which can affect the thinking of any of the three sources.)

While this process may sometimes be enough to allow us to work toward helping the child modify his behavior, we need only one illustration to indicate the potential dangers of such a way of working: In virtually every classroom there is a child who shows very little control over his impulses—who cannot tolerate the least bit of criticism, rebuff, or frustration. This child often responds to normal classroom routine, activities, and interaction with classmates by aggressive behavior which disturbs the other children so much that they then devote as little attention to their work as he does. All our information and observations point to this child's great need for increased self-control. And so we try, in our casework interviews, to help him see the need for, and achieve self-control. Let us even assume that, after a long span of time, he "calms down" to a point where he causes no more trouble. We feel successful and close the case, assuming that we have supplied the external controls and incentive to behave more acceptably which the parents have failed to provide.

But suppose we are wrong in our assump-

tion. Suppose this child's parents have not failed to impose limits upon him but instead have imposed so many limits that the child is virtually strangling within them at home. Out of his great fear of losing their love by disobeying them, he is a "very proper child" at home. In fact, he never causes any trouble at home because he quietly withdraws into isolation and only engages in any sort of self-assertive activity outside of the home and in his fantasies. Unfortunately, of course, this child's behavior in school is often exceptionally and dangerously aggressive and destructive because he has had to suppress his normal wishes for self-expression so radically in order to find parental acceptance and approval. What happens to this child when we deprive him of the school as an outlet for his aggressiveness? It is all too possible that we have driven him further into the world of fantasy, the only world in which he can be an independent individual who "counts for something to others."

This is not a suggestion that schools should be used as places in which aggression can be freely displayed on all occasions and in all directions. Certainly a large part of our job is to help children retain their aggressiveness but direct it into appropriate channels and learn to control it in certain surroundings. But this can best be accomplished by trying to help the family grow more realistic in their expectations about their child along with or perhaps even instead of working directly with the child. Those children whose hyperaggressiveness in school is *not* the result of parents' failure to provide limits but results rather from too many unreasonable limits applied by parents will continue to have tremendous unmet needs even if they are able to achieve self-control in school. We may be able to help them behave more acceptably in school, but at what cost? In such a case we have helped the school but failed to help the child.

Admittedly, this illustration is greatly oversimplified and overdrawn. But it

serves to point out the risks we run when we do not have complete enough material to enable us to know accurately what a child needs. To know that he needs greater self-control is to know half the story. We must also know why he needs it, or we cannot really help him.

HELPING THE CHILD DEAL WITH DISTURBING FACTORS

Part two of the worker's goal is to help the child deal differently with factors disturbing him so that his school functioning will improve. The hypothetical case stated above also serves to illustrate difficulties involved in trying to accomplish this without involving parents. We can think of other examples of children with behavior patterns quite different from the one just discussed. Suppose we have a child referred because of extreme timidity. This child responds to normal teasing from classmates and helpful criticism from the teacher by crying, withdrawing, and growing more fearful. He is never able to fight back in any playground disputes, and hovers around the teacher at the first sign of aggressiveness or anger in his environment. Let us assume that the worker has, in this case, held parent interviews and has found the child to be "poured from the same mold" as his parents, people who grow so anxious at any show of hostility or so upset that they cannot tolerate normal boisterousness in their children.

If the worker then has no further dealings with the parents but begins working with the child toward helping him achieve necessary self-confidence, what will happen? How can we help a child achieve self-confidence and self-respect in relation to his classmates as long as he sees himself derided as a "sissy" and a "crybaby"? Our efforts must, of necessity, be geared toward helping him stand up for himself with the other children. If we are successful in this, the chances are all too great that he will grow more aggressive and self-assertive at home,

when too. If his parents are unable to feel comfortable with this behavior and have no material help in handling their own feelings and that a greater help, they must show the child disapproval and fears, they must show the child disapproval of his changed attitudes. We can-

In a situation like this, we have helped to create greater problems for the child than the ones he had before we met him. This child is not nearly old enough or mature enough to stand alone. He is trying to build an integrated personality, and his main source of identification, support, and emotional nourishment needed for this task is his family. When we try to wean a child from the behavior patterns acceptable in his family before he is "strong" enough to do without his family's support and approval, we lead him toward disintegration rather than integration.

THE CHILD'S NEEDS

In the two illustrations just posed, it is assumed that the worker has been successful in his efforts to bring about change in the child's behavior without involving the parents in the process. Actually, this assumption should be made only for purposes of pointing out possibilities which may result from such a means of working. In most instances, these efforts would pay off only in frustration for the worker, and not in feelings of success, for this means of working runs counter to everything we know about the needs of children in this age range. As stated before, the child's major concern at this time is to build an integrated personality; he must effect a satisfactory compromise between his own wants and impulses and the demands placed upon him by his environment. This is at best a painful job, fraught with unavoidable pitfalls and obstacles, when his environment is making fairly uniform demands upon him. When he is faced with quite different sets of demands, with the school expecting conformity to a rather different set, his task of integration becomes even more difficult. Many children already

have the strength to accomplish this task adequately. Often, however, children referred to school social workers lack this degree of strength. If such children succeed in adapting themselves to the demands of the environment they are in at each particular time of their lives, they do so at the price of failing to build an integrated personality, and run the risk of being unable to function adequately if their future life situations become very complex. The alternative to this kind of adjustment would be for them to choose between the conflicting demands, thereby retaining the approval of one part of their environment and drawing hostility from the other.

Obviously, the best climate for a child exists when the various parts of his environment are similar enough in their demands upon him so that the child must deal mainly with the one problem of integrating his own set of desires with one other fairly consistent set of desires. Once he has adequately resolved this problem by building a solid core of ideals and behavior patterns which he can regard as "himself and what he stands for," he is in a much better position to adapt successfully himself to different environments and life situations without the danger of extreme anxiety and disintegration. We cannot regard all elementary school age children as having reached this point.

THE PARENTS' NEEDS

From the standpoint of the child's needs, therefore, it is essential that we try to work with the parents, too. But what about the parents' needs? We know that the majority of parents have sufficient respect for the school as an agency doing an important job to keep them from objecting very strenuously if the school social worker wants to work with their child. We know also that most parents are concerned about what their children are doing and want to have a part in their interests, worries, and activities. They often wish to be co-operative,

and give permission for the worker to see the child. If that's the last they hear about it except for statements the child subsequently makes about his interviews, it should not be surprising to find these parents descending upon the school with a barrage of hostility, because they really have been shown no respect for their rights as parents. Of course they are being defensive, but we have given them every reason to be defensive by our lack of consideration for them.

In such cases we often get quite angry when the child tells us how his parents "pump" him about his interviews and when we see evidence of their efforts to sabotage the work we are trying to do. When this happens, we have a right to be angry only with ourselves, for these parents are only having reactions of jealousy, hurt, and competitive feelings which we have stimulated needlessly. When we see only the child, it is too easy for us to overidentify with him to such a degree that we grow angry with his parents for "mistreating" him. Without realizing it, we often say things about the parents that indicate all too clearly how we feel. When the child then carries these statements home, adding his own distortions of them along the way, the parents cannot help but feel we are trying to turn their child against them. Neither can parents help but grow anxious, defensive, and combative in the face of this. The child becomes merely a pawn in the competitive struggle between worker and parents for his allegiance.

If all this happens when the child is being fairly truthful in describing his parents' attitudes, what more damage results when a worker overidentifies with an untruthful child? We prefer to think of children as being honest and sincere with us once we have won their confidence. But certainly there are children whose problems arise from their efforts to control and manipulate people. When such a child vividly expresses himself as an unfortunate being who is not well understood by his

parents, and the worker, giving himself no opportunity to verify this through working with the parents, falls in with the child's thinking, he has been "seduced." And the child's idea that people can and should be manipulated to achieve one's goals has gained fresh support and will be that much harder to discredit in his eyes.

WORK WITH PARENTS IS ESSENTIAL

Perhaps enough has been said now to establish the principle that we cannot be fully helpful to children of this age without working closely with their parents, and attention should now be directed toward the kind of work we can do with parents. Because our function is to help the child in school, we must focus on the parent-child relationship as it is affecting the child's school performance. This does not mean that we totally shun discussion of any area not directly involved in this parent-child relationship because it is, of course, impossible to chop people up into neat segments of life and deal only with one segment at a time. While severe financial deprivation may not be the real basis for the child's school difficulties, it certainly affects the parents' ability to meet their children's needs. If parents' thoughts and energies are almost entirely devoted to problems of providing food, clothing, and shelter for the children and themselves, they obviously are not so capable of meeting emotional needs as they might be with more economic security. When we find families like this, we cannot write them off by deciding not to work with them until they have more energy to devote to the subject uppermost in *our* minds. We must instead see if we can help them find other resources to help them improve their circumstances.

Similarly, if we find parents' energies being channeled into dealing with the anxieties aroused by unhappy marital situations, health problems, or emotional problems of their own quite apart from

Social Work

their relationships with their children, we must not cut off discussion of these problems because they lie beyond our function. Naturally, we will want to refer these parents to the appropriate community agencies which can provide the help they need. In order to do this successfully, we must first establish a good relationship with the parents in which they sense our understanding of them and our wish to help. While it is indeed true that parents cannot devote adequate attention to meeting their children's needs while their own needs are greatly unmet, it does not follow that we need only to supply them with a list of appropriate resources and wait until they can absorb themselves more with what we are trying to do. We help these people by at least working with them long enough to provide the needed support and encouragement for them to follow through on a referral. In addition, we can often work directly with them on their children's needs while they are receiving help from another agency, provided we are in close touch with the other agency so that we do not work at cross purposes or impose too many burdens upon a family at one time.

"CLIENTS" OR "COLLATERALS"

Probably in most of our cases we will find that we are able to establish a good working relationship with parents focused upon their children's needs with other family problems entering the discussions now and then as they affect the parent-child relationship. Now we must decide if we will view these parents as "collaterals" or as "clients." We see them as collaterals when our interviews become a matter of reporting back and forth on the child's progress or lack of it. Parents certainly want to know our impressions of the child as we work with him. However, we do not fulfill our purpose if we do nothing but report our impressions. Of far greater importance is the parents' relationship with the child, and this should be the focus of parent interviews. We only go through the motions of

working with parents when we visit periodically to give and get a progress report. By doing this we clearly show that we are interested in them only insofar as they share four walls with the child, and not as individuals worthy of our concern and respect.

Saying to the parent, for example, "Doris has been crying a lot in class and in interviews lately; I'm planning to encourage her more to tell me what's bothering her," informs the parent of what you are doing but effectively leaves him out of the helping process. Again, this can lead to competitive elements developing in the relationship of worker and parent toward each other and toward the child. How different the response can be when we say instead, "Doris has appeared more upset lately in school. Have you noticed this at home?" While the parent may not want to admit it at first, with enough acceptance and encouragement he will often tell us not only that he *has* noticed it but what he thinks lies behind it and how it is affecting him. When he feels free enough to tell us of his own feelings about his relationship with his child, we are then in a position to help him clarify his thinking and decide what he wants to do about it. In other words, our greatest help comes from viewing the parents as our clients as well as the child. We must show parents that we want to help them and their child both, on the assumption that they do not want to see their child unhappy. We must indicate to them our faith that they not only have as much capacity as we do to be helpful to their child, but even more, for they are so very much more important to their child than we can ever be.

SHOULD PARENTS BE SEEN SEPARATELY?

Two questions frequently debated about working with parents are whether it is wise for the same worker to see both parents and child, and whether fathers and mothers should be interviewed separately or at the

same time. These questions can best be answered on an individual basis, for certainly there will be children whose problems center so greatly on the matter of sharing things with others that they cannot respond to a worker whom they must share with their parents. Most children this age, however, are far more comfortable when they sense a worker's honesty, respect, and co-operation with his parents as well as with themselves. The crucial question here seems to be the worker's feeling of comfort. When the worker's own feelings of competition with parents are powerful, the child will know it and will prefer not to get drawn into such a situation. On the other hand, when the worker's feelings are geared toward being one unit of a team including worker, child, parents, teacher, and principal all working to improve a difficult situation, the child soon realizes he need not have fears about his parents' talking things over with his worker.

Fathers should probably be seen individually if the child's problems relate more particularly to the father-child relationship. Because mothers are usually more deeply involved in their children's daily living experiences and have more time to give us, we understandably concentrate more on individualized work with them. Let us not forget, however, that in many cases the central difficulties causing problems for a child can revolve around his relationship with his father instead of, or as much as with his mother.

The writer disagrees with the common feeling that parents should necessarily be interviewed separately when they present different attitudes toward handling their children. It is entirely possible to show our desire to understand both parents' viewpoints even if the viewpoints diverge radically while all three are discussing the situation. In such interviews we frequently find a "family row" arising in which each parent once again heatedly tries to convince the other of the truth behind his own position. There is a vital difference, however, be-

tween such an argument taking place with or without the presence of the worker. For one thing, the discussion can be more purposeful because the worker enters in periodically to keep the focus on how these differences affect the child and the argument does not therefore range far afield to bring in all the grievances each parent has held toward the other since the wedding day. These statements by the worker indicate his belief that each parent sincerely wants to help his child and that, once they realize how their differing approaches to the child may confuse him, they will work to find a way to reconcile their differences. Another advantage of the workers being involved in such interviews is that no room is left for possible distortion of his statements. We all know that people too often hear only what they want to hear, and we have doubtless been chagrined to find an irate father demanding to know why we told mother how right she was when we had said no such thing in our interview with her. Such unnecessary episodes can be avoided by the simple means of saying things in the presence of both parents. If, in their discussion of our comments, they begin to distort the meaning to meet their individual needs, we are still there to prevent this from continuing.

FREQUENCY OF INTERVIEWS

The frequency of parent interviews is still another question. If we regard parents as being as much our clients as the children, it follows that they should be seen equally or almost as often as the children. Naturally, this takes a great deal of the worker's time, and it would mean drastically cutting case loads down from the average size we now find. There would doubtless be considerable objection to such a policy on the part of school people who must be mindful of budgetary considerations and the large number of children needing help. But the worker can overcome most of these objections by presenting his reasons for feeling this is the proper way to work

BIT: *Working with Parents*

effectively. By working with the parents and the child toward the same goals, and by involving the parents in working constructively to help their child through improving their relationship to him, we can cut down tremendously on the number of interviews with each child. Once the parents have begun handling their child more constructively, we can often stop working with the child ourselves, continuing with the parents for as long as they need us.

Thus, as we more clearly delineate our

goals in school social work, and refine our thinking about how to reach these goals, we shall grow more skillful in doing our job. It would seem far wiser to work with a smaller number of children and their parents than to work with many children and not their parents during a school year. We might even be surprised to find, at the end of the year, that we had worked with more children anyway because, by involving the parents, we have started the helping process rolling much more quickly.

BY MORRIS JANOWITZ

Public Perspectives on Social Security

SOCIAL SECURITY HAS become, within two brief decades, an accepted feature of American society. Each year new proposals are made for its modification or extension, and many of these proposals must be assessed on the basis of knowledge or assumptions about questions which are essentially factual in origin. In some problem areas, such as actuarial information, effective use is made of the most advanced knowledge and research procedures that are available. In other areas, notably those involving public understanding of and attitudes toward the social security program, there has been conspicuous lack of application of social science research advances.

The reasons for this research lag are complex. In part, inquiry into public atti-

tudes by a government agency is subject to interpretation as lobbying or as an effort to substitute opinion polling for legislation. Moreover, social research is bound to raise questions which, however pertinent to honest inquiry, may be exploited by hostile pressure groups attacking a program.

The context and scope of the social security program have been brought into a new phase, however. The 1953 efforts of a few die-hards to make basic modifications in the social security program were rejected by Republicans and Democrats alike. The policy maker and administrator now are in a position to take a detached look at their public.

What the client, actual and potential, knows and thinks becomes important information for internal administration. In insisting that the bulk of the population, not merely a simple majority, ought to have "adequate" knowledge of key welfare programs, it is hardly suggested that details of eligibility requirements and benefit amounts are necessary. But without elementary knowledge by persons of their status under these programs and the major risks which are covered, the objectives of the programs are frustrated and the daily task of the social security administrator is immensely complicated. The social se-

MORRIS JANOWITZ is associate professor, Department of Sociology, and research associate, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. The empirical data in this paper are based on the findings of a study carried out by the Detroit Area Study, a research group of the University of Michigan operating under a grant from the Behavioral Sciences Division of the Ford Foundation. The findings presented constitute one aspect of a larger investigation of "The Impact of Administrative Behavior on the Metropolitan Community."

Perspectives on Social Security

curity program, moreover, was designed to enhance democratic consensus and to reduce feelings of insecurity. Here public attitudes about social security become crucial.

Of course, the administrator assumes that his day-to-day experiences give him a sensitive understanding of the awareness, attitudes, and demands of his clients and the public at large. It is necessary to demonstrate to him that his knowledge is segmental and that it can be increased by use of such social science research procedures as the sample survey. Unfortunately, research into the public's appraisal of social security by social scientists is indeed limited.¹

THE STUDY

This is a report on the results of a limited effort to chart public understanding and attitudes toward old-age and survivors' insurance. The population on which the report is based is that of a northern industrial center—the Detroit metropolitan area. The questions on the social insurance program were included in an hour-long survey interview which was concerned with certain demographic and social trends in Detroit, and which sought specific information on knowledge and attitudes about a variety of public agencies, including law enforcement agencies, the school system, and state and local government. The findings are presented mainly to highlight a problem which merits detailed and extensive study, and to illustrate the applicability of the sample survey method to problems of social welfare.

¹ William H. Sewell, Charles E. Ramsey, and Louis J. Ducoff, *Farmers' Conceptions and Plans for Economic Security in Old Age*, Bulletin No. 182 of the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life, Bureau of Agricultural Economics (September 1953).

John W. McConnell and Robert Risley, *Economic Security: A Study of Community Needs and Resources*, Bulletin No. 18 of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University (July 1951).

In charting the public's appraisal of social security, two types of data were collected. First, *knowledge and information*: what percentage of the population possesses correct information about key benefits? Second, *public evaluation*: to what extent are basic program goals approved by the public? Are the benefits judged as being adequate or inadequate for personal and family requirements?

Survey research methodology is adaptable to ascertain the level of factual knowledge the public has at its disposal concerning the key benefits. By means of probability area sampling procedures, a representative cross section of 764 homes (household units) in the Detroit metropolitan area were interviewed between January and April 1954.² Since interviews were completed in 86 percent of the homes on the original list to be interviewed, representativeness of the sample was guaranteed. Detroit, like each of the major metropolitan areas in which the majority of the population resides, has special industrial features; for example, it has a particularly high concentration of Southern migrants in the labor force. Although the findings of this survey must be confirmed by research on other industrial centers, as far as knowledge and attitudes toward social security are concerned, there is no reason to believe that Detroit is especially unique as compared with other metropolitan areas.

The interview schedule made use of a combination of direct questions and indirect free response questions and averaged one hour in length. The interviewers presented themselves as representatives of the

² The area covered in the survey does not coincide exactly with the official Detroit Standard Metropolitan Area as used by the U.S. Census Bureau. The census area includes all of Wayne, Macomb, and Oakland counties. In the Detroit Area Study, those areas are excluded in the outlying points of the three counties which are not divided into census tracts. Thereby, the region covered by our sample includes approximately 89 percent of the adult population of the three counties. An adult was defined as a person at least 21 years old.

University of Michigan. Rapport was maintained by means of the skill of the interviewer, the intrinsic interest of the respondent in the subject, and by the appeal to participate in a worth-while social research project.

LEVEL OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE

The level of factual knowledge the public displayed must be considered low from almost any standpoint. When the representative cross section sample was asked what benefits social security provides, only 26 percent could be scored as giving a correct answer (Table No. 1).³ A correct answer meant awareness that social security provided both old-age and survivors' benefits.⁴

As a result of the simple way in which questions were posed and the answers scored, the low figure of 26 percent with correct knowledge about social security benefits tends to err, if it errs at all, on the side of overestimating the percentage of correct answers. It is true, however, that 48 percent gave partially correct answers. The partially correct answers were composed of those who mentioned only old-age benefits and the very small percentage (3 percent) mentioning only survivors' benefits. Since the partially correct answer generally meant failure to include survivors' benefits, it is indeed striking to note the extent to which the respondents, even after probing, were unaware of this crucial social welfare benefit. Twenty-one percent of the persons interviewed gave answers which can only be interpreted as reflecting incorrect, inadequate, or just no knowledge of social security benefits.⁵

³ The text of the question was: "What benefits does social security entitle you to?" Responses or lack of responses were followed up by standardized probing.

⁴ As used in this study, social security refers only to the OASI program.

⁵ The 21 percent was composed of 12 percent who gave outright incorrect answers, and 9 percent who gave "don't know" answers. Only 5 per-

TABLE 1. KNOWLEDGE OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Knowledge of Social Security Benefits	Total %
Correct	26
Partially correct	48
Incorrect	12
Don't know	9
Not ascertained	5
	100
Total number of cases	(764)

Two sets of factors—social background and social welfare experiences—seemed important to investigate as conditioners of the level of knowledge that members of the public held. First, how did the individual's educational background and his position in the social structure relate to his knowledge of social security benefits? Second, how did actual contact—personal and family—with the social security program influence knowledge?

It is a widespread assumption that the fullest understanding of the processes of government resides in the better-educated groups and in the middle and upper social classes. Nevertheless, it was an underlying hypothesis of this research that educational attainment and corresponding position in the social structure would not adequately account for what people knew about benefit rights. Formal education would undoubtedly increase generalized knowledge about the processes of government and social welfare. But since these programs cut across class lines (and therefore educational levels), their actual impact—direct and indirect—ought to disseminate knowledge into the lower classes. In other terms,

cent had to be classified as not ascertained. A somewhat similar level of knowledge was encountered in the responses to the question whether an individual could have private insurance and still receive his old-age benefits. Again, more than one quarter (29 percent) gave answers which had to be judged that the individual lacked the basic knowledge involved; 13 percent gave the wrong answer; 29 percent thought yes, but were not certain; and 32 percent gave the right answer with assurance.

TABLE 2. KNOWLEDGE OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AND EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Knowledge of Social Security Benefits	Educational Level				
	6 years or less %	7 or 8 years %	Some high school %	Graduated high school %	College %
Correct	8	17	25	31	45
Partially correct	51	50	53	46	44
Incorrect	12	17	12	13	6
Don't know; not ascertained	29	16	10	10	5
	100	100	100	100	100
Number of cases	(113)	(133)	(173)	(236)	(109)

the self-interest of the public and its actual contact with these programs ought to work to overcome educational limitations.

The link between formal education and the level of correct knowledge about social security benefits is clearly present (Table No. 2). It is, however, a relationship that is most at work for those with very high education or with very limited education, the extremes so to speak. But even the college-educated hardly presented a really "passing" grade. Of those with college education, 45 percent gave correct responses, while those with less than six years of education gave only 8 percent correct answers with respect to social security benefits. The pattern of correct knowledge varied much less for the groups with more average amounts of education. Furthermore, the consequence of education was most important for correct versus incorrect answers. Partially correct answers were spread through the population almost without regard to level of education.

When the link between social class position and level of knowledge was investigated, an increasing level of correct knowledge about social security was encountered for each higher social class position.⁶ Therefore, the next step in the analysis was to examine directly how far the impact of these programs on the various educational

and social class groupings conditioned the level of knowledge.

CONTACT WITH SOCIAL SECURITY

In analyzing the impact of contact with the social security program, it was first appropriate to ascertain who had dealings with the program aside from making contributions. What were the social class backgrounds of those who had had such contact? Contact with social security meant that the individual respondent was a member of a family, at least one member of which was receiving benefits: either old-age benefits or survivors' benefits or both.

The social security program was originally launched with a view to the special impact it would have on the the working class. Nevertheless, social security has had a history of a gradual extension of coverage.⁷ As a result, the social class backgrounds of those who have received benefits reveal the striking extent to which the impact of these programs cuts across social class lines. As of the time of the survey, 20 percent of the sample reported that they were members of families in which at least one person was receiving old-age or survivors' benefits or both. The finding that an almost similar percentage of families in

⁶ See Footnote 8 for the empirical definition of class.

⁷ "The Social Security Act: The First Twenty Years," *Social Security Bulletin* (August 1955). See especially Wilbur J. Cohen, "Social Security Objectives and Achievement," pp. 2-5.

TABLE 3. RECEIPT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS, SHOWN BY SOCIAL CLASS OF FAMILY UNIT ⁸

Benefit Status	Social Class of Family Unit				
	Lower Working %	Upper Working %	Lower Middle %	Upper Middle %	Total *
Receives some type of benefit	25	18	17	18	20
Receives no benefit; not eligible	71	75	75	75	74
Not ascertained; don't know	4	7	8	7	6
Number of cases	100 (250)	100 (207)	100 (186)	100 (106)	100 (764)

* Total column includes 15 cases for which social class breakdown could not be ascertained.

both the working and middle classes were currently receiving social security benefits was unexpected and highlights the extent to which this program has already been functioning for the community at large (Table No. 3). Approximately 18 percent of the upper working class, the lower middle, and upper middle class reported that some member of their family was receiving social security benefits. There was no difference for these class groups as to type of benefit, either. Only for the lower working class was the percentage somewhat higher (25 percent) and undoubtedly included some recipients of direct old-age assistance.

However, examination of the consequences of agency contact for all social groups brings into sharp relief the strategic

problem of developing a democratically informed public. It was not surprising that, for each of the specific social class groupings, contact (personal and family) improved knowledge of benefits of both programs⁹ (Table No. 4). What is crucial is that the pragmatic education provided by contact with these agencies eliminated the disabilities derived from a lack of formal education among those in low social class positions. Forty percent of the lower working class who had had contact gave correct answers to the queries about social security benefits, a proportion which exceeded both the upper working class, and the lower middle class. In fact, there appears a tendency for less knowledge to be derived from contact as one moves up the social class ladder, with the marked exception of the upper middle class. Here is direct evidence that the lower classes are not disproportionately uninformed as to their stake in the social security program; self-interest operates to overcome educational limitations. Nevertheless, it is necessary to keep in mind that the amount of ignorance which persisted in

⁸ The empirical definition of social class was based on the Bureau of Census occupation code, with special adjustments in a small percentage of cases based on income, residence, or ethnic considerations. In only 19 percent of the cases did the inclusion of these additional criteria of social class modify the classification based on occupation alone. Following are the social classes to which occupational groups were assigned: *lower working*—operatives and kindred service workers, laborers; *upper working*—craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers; *lower middle*—sales workers, clerical and kindred workers, semiprofessional; *upper middle*—managers, officials, and proprietors except farm, professional, technical and kindred workers. Since the size of the upper class is statistically so minute, it is reported together with the upper middle class.

⁹ In the case of the lower middle class, increase in knowledge about social security benefits through contact presents a somewhat different pattern. There is a slight, but statistically not significant, decrease in correct knowledge as contact increases and a very marked increase in partially correct knowledge.

TABLE 4. KNOWLEDGE OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AND FAMILY UNIT RECEIPT OF BENEFITS, SHOWN BY SOCIAL CLASS

Knowledge of social security benefits	Social Class of Family Unit							
	Lower Working		Upper Working		Lower Middle		Upper Middle	
	Bene-fits recd.* (%)	No bene-fits (%)	Bene-fits recd.* (%)	No bene-fits (%)	Bene-fits recd.* (%)	No bene-fits (%)	Bene-fits recd.* (%)	No bene-fits (%)
Correct	40	15	34	20	24	29	66	39
Partially correct	48	50	58	50	73	45	29	43
Incorrect	10	23	3	14	3	8	5	5
Don't know; not ascertained	2	12	5	16	..	18	..	13
Number of cases	100 (52)	100 (198)	100 (38)	100 (169)	100 (29)	100 (157)	100 (21)	100 (85)

* Respondent was a member of a family unit in which at least one person was receiving old-age or survivors' benefits, or both.

all classes even after personal and family contact with this basic social welfare program is indeed immense.

ACCEPTANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY

These low levels of public information need to be evaluated in the context of the public's approval of the objectives of social security. Lack of knowledge was not based on indifference or lack of approval. To the contrary, the exploratory work which preceded this survey revealed that a basic acceptance of social security pervaded the entire social structure. As of 1955, the idea of "social security" was so well accepted that in our pretesting it was impossible to find any statistically significant group that was opposed to the underlying principle. This is not to assert that considerable areas of disagreement about the desired scope of the program do not exist. It is most unfortunate that trend data on public opinion about social security from the time of its inception are not available to contrast with this current state of opinion. The few scattered questions that have been asked by national opinion surveys reveal that social security from its inception has had majority support and that in the intervening years

there has been a decline of even minority opposition to social security. For example, in 1937, 27 percent of the national population answered "no" to the question "Do you approve of the social security tax?" while 73 percent responded "yes."¹⁰

Furthermore, it was possible to undertake some investigation of the public's estimate of the adequacy of social security to meet their personal needs for retirement. It is not the goal of social security to provide an adequate basis for retirement for all groups under its coverage. Yet, social security has as one of its goals reducing feelings of economic insecurity and this requires some realistic measure of understanding about the potentialities and limitations of the program. Only a most limited effort could be made in charting these complex expectations and attitudes. The approach employed was designed to tap feelings of security and realistic understanding of social security and, of course, not actual adequacy. Attitudes were

¹⁰ "Do you approve of this [social security] tax?" (*American Institute of Public Opinion*) December 1937: "Yes," 73 percent, "no," 27 percent = 100 percent; "no opinion," 5 percent.

probed by means of the question: "How well do you think social security benefits will meet your needs when you retire?"¹¹ The questioning deliberately omitted reference to the realistic condition that social security assumes supplementation out of personal or other resources, since awareness of both the potentialities and limitations had to be charted.

By this measure, only 22 percent of the total sample voiced opinions that could be classified as reflecting a feeling that social security benefits would provide adequate assistance for retirement needs. Interestingly enough, the majority of those with this outlook spontaneously made reference to the point that adequacy depended on supplementation from personal resources. Fifty-four percent expressed the opinion that social security benefits would be inadequate (38 percent inadequate, 16 percent very inadequate). Eighteen fell into the ambiguous "I don't know" category and must also be viewed as not having a positive response to this question of the adequacy of social security benefits. The question was interpreted as not applicable to the 6 percent who were not covered or not dependent on social security.

When these responses were broken down, feelings of adequacy were found to be somewhat higher among the lowest social class group (the lower working class). As to age, there was a tendency, although again not pronounced, for the level of satisfaction to decline with age, especially in the oldest age groups. In the absence of data charting the pattern of attitudes on this issue over the last decade, the evaluation of these findings is difficult. Certainly, on a *priori* grounds it is disappointing that a realistic sense of satisfaction and security was not more frequently expressed.

SUMMARY

In summary, the findings of the Detroit Area Study underline that the emergence of public acceptance of social security has

hardly been accompanied by an adequate understanding of even the key benefits involved. Higher social class position and more adequate education were found to be linked with higher levels of correct information about social security benefits. The actual distribution of these benefits was found to penetrate already more deeply into the middle class than had been expected. In turn, the important observation emerged that personal and family contact with the program worked to overcome almost all the social class and educational differences as to level of knowledge.

But the heart of the matter rests in the level of ignorance that persists even after personal and family contacts. Social welfare administrators, public affairs leaders, and communication specialists must face the stark reality that the majority of the population is unable to translate its self-interest into an adequate level of understanding of this key social welfare program. This is not a matter of lower class ignorance, for the lack of knowledge penetrates too deeply into the middle class. No doubt, widespread ignorance exists about other basic functions of governmental enterprise. But ignorance about the key benefits of social security is likely to have greater disruptive consequences for social stability than ignorance of other governmental activity since this program is designed to deal directly with the sources of mass insecurity. Faced with the insecurities of a mass-industrialized society, it seems reasonable to assume that knowledge about benefits might contribute to reducing insecurities.

However, the inference can be drawn from this study that public approval of social security does not rest on a realistic estimate of the program's role in meeting individual aspirations. With mass media content pressing for higher and higher standards of consumption even during the

¹¹ For those already receiving social security benefits, the question was phrased: "How well do social security benefits meet your needs?"

Perspectives on Social Security

period of retirement, such an outlook is to be expected and is certainly likely to continue. Perhaps the point might be stated alternatively, that if it is the objective of social security to contribute to the integration and stability of a democratic society by reducing the level of insecurity about retirement, even our limited data indicate that this frontier remains to be reached.

The implications of these findings clearly point to the need for developing a new approach to the persistent task of guaranteeing that social welfare programs will have an adequately informed public. A major share of the task must of necessity fall to the general mass media; but here progress seems likely only if the responsible policy makers accept these informational objectives as strategic goals. There are, however, sufficient clues from studies in

the field of communication and public opinion that trade unions and voluntary associations supply important potential channels of access to specific social groups. Beyond this, for the unreachable, those whose self-interest does not guide them to psychologically realistic concerns or who are unaffiliated or at least nonparticipants in associational life—for them, their children and the public education system remain as a possible mass communication channel. In this respect, the observation of many social scientists that children must and do help socialize and educate their parents in modern society assumes specific meaning. Finally, the research methodology which produced these findings offers continuing possibilities for tracing out means by which more effective communications might be established with the various publics of the social security program.

POINTS AND VIEWPOINTS

Manuscript Policy

THE EDITORIAL BOARD sees its obligation as to try to elicit papers which represent the highest level of professional practice. In the front of the book, papers will appear which show the range of professional purpose, program, and social policy. Some practitioners, accustomed to an emphasis on more intimate technical proficiency, may miss the informal descriptive paper because *SOCIAL WORK* will carry, so far as resources permit, those papers which have something of this overview, which come to grips with the reach of professional knowledge and experience, modest as it still is. There will be no priorities for special fields other than those already contracted for by the collaborating former associations. Priority will be given to those articles that clarify the role of social work purpose within the larger objective of health and welfare. Contributions from colleagues in the other helping professions will be welcome, but in the main *SOCIAL WORK* will be the vehicle by which all may see the quality, motivation, and achievement of social work as a profession.

ACCEPTABLE MANUSCRIPTS¹

On what basis or according to what standards does the Editorial Board accept manuscripts for publication in the journal? Manuscripts should (1) have pertinence for and applicability in some part of the field of social work, such as practice, education, supervision, research, community relations,

¹ This statement is paraphrased from the one made by Dr. Luther Woodward in the *Journal of Psychiatric Social Work*, June 1952. The additional note comes from the Book Review Committee.

interprofessional co-operation, etc.; (2) say something that is new or say it more clearly and forcefully than it has been said before (writers should scan all articles in several previous issues and avoid these subjects, or develop a chosen subject differently); (3) consist of well-organized facts, accurately described and evaluated professional experience, or clearly formulated theory or opinion having some observational or experiential basis; (4) have enough depth and clarity to justify the expectation that most readers will learn something from it; (5) maintain a reasonably sharp focus and avoid excessive generalizations; (6) possess coherence and untechnical terms for the most part, and present a well-ordered sequence of ideas which give ready flow to the piece.

Articles that possess strength in all these regards are editors' delight. Manuscripts that are exceptionally strong in three or more regards and without glaring weaknesses in others are likely to be accepted. Manuscripts that have considerable merit but need building out or tightening up may be returned for rewriting with appropriate editorial suggestions.

BOOK REVIEWS

Book reviews should not be articles. Since we are trying to cover more, rather than fewer books, reviews will be about 250 words, with 500 words the absolute limit. Such short reviews are harder to do and require more skill than the longer ones. However, by indicating a desired length of reviews, there is an implied editorial privilege to cut long reviews. Brief mentions will carry annotations of about 50 words, perhaps covering a dozen books in each issue.

Points and Viewpoints

"Meet Me in Munich"

"MEET ME IN MUNICH" is, in social work circles, a familiar 1956 greeting. And well it might be, for Munich is to be host to the eighth biennial meeting of the International Conference of Social Work and a record-breaking United States delegation is already assured. By late July, half a thousand practitioners and volunteer leaders in assorted health and welfare activities will be taking off by sea or air for Munich and related travel study.

Nothing like this has happened with earlier international welfare conferences held far away from this country. True, the delegation to Madras, India, in 1952 exceeded one hundred and, considering the traveling distances involved, this was proportionately as large a delegation as the forthcoming Munich group. But the major interest of delegates to the Madras meeting was centered on India as a setting, not the conference as a program. In the case of Munich, major interest is centered on the conference theme and its implications for this country, quite as much as for other parts of the world in which United States delegates happen to be especially interested.

The theme is "Machine and Man: Industrialization and Its Effect on Social Work for Family and Community Welfare." It is a broad theme, for the process of industrialization is as broad throughout the world as the new social and economic forces affecting community development—in the underdeveloped as well as the highly developed countries. Yet from the standpoint of the United States, it is a sharply focused theme, for American advance preparation has brought many of us to realize sharply how deeply the maturing industrialization process has affected every phase of American living—from the family circle to seats of government.

In preparation for Munich and with the help of a grant made by the Russell Sage Foundation, a monograph was prepared by

Dr. Harold L. Wilensky of the Department of Sociology at the University of Michigan, and Dr. Charles N. Lebeaux, professor of social welfare at the School of Social Work of Wayne University. The monograph was not, as some have mistakenly considered it, a "U. S. position paper for Munich"; it constituted an analysis by two respected scholars from their own point of view of the impact of industrialization on social welfare. Official "position" or not, the Wilensky-Lebeaux contribution has been important. It has helped to prepare our thinking for participation at Munich (those of us who plan to go): it also poses sharp questions which will be debated long into many nights for many a month as professional and volunteer groups discuss the implications of the authors' findings.

Some of those who reviewed the monograph have deplored its possible effect upon social workers from other countries with insufficient knowledge of the American scene to differentiate between solid facts and the authors' opinions. Others have felt that it is good for social welfare leadership in other countries to learn that the American profession is by no means smugly set in its convictions regarding professional policy and practice.

This issue is an important one but by no means the most important connected with either the monograph or the Munich Conference. More important is the fact that the U. S. Committee report to the conference—consisting of the monograph, *Industrialization and Social Welfare*, nine local community reports prepared on the same theme, the July 1955 issue of the *Social Work Journal*, and a bulletin of the Social Security Administration covering a twenty-year span of social welfare development—provides every U. S. participant with a solid grounding in industrialization's effects upon our own society; and this is the vestibule for an effective learning-and-sharing experience at Munich. We are a big country and an important one, but the world is even bigger and infinitely more im-

portant. Munich will make this increasingly clear to a growing body of our social welfare leadership.

LESTER B. GRANGER

U. S. Committee

International Conference of Social Work

Employment Service

THE STATE EMPLOYMENT services have improved considerably in the past ten years. Progress has been made in locating the local employment offices in attractive premises in many communities. Likewise, the professional competence of local office personnel has been advanced and modern methods of matching man and job are being more extensively used. Of particular interest to the National Association of Social Workers is how these improvements affect the interest of the social worker.

It was for the National Conference of Social Work at Cleveland in 1953 that the U. S. Employment Service arranged with the Ohio State Employment Service to maintain employment service facilities at the convention. This was the first time that many association members had an opportunity to view the public employment office operations at close range. The service was used much more extensively than was expected, and, while it was considered a success, there were changes to be made before the convention in Atlantic City. An improved service was available at the subsequent annual conferences in Atlantic City, San Francisco, and St. Louis. Similar service is also being made available to other professional organizations. This convention placement service is just a segment of employment service resources that are available.

It might be said that the interest of the social work profession starts with the work which the state-federal employment service is doing with high-school students. During the past ten years, a counseling or vocational guidance program has become effective on a nationwide basis. While there was such a service available in a few states before that time, counseling service

is now available in all 1,700 local public employment offices. As a result of a co-operative program developed with school authorities, high-school graduates in 5,000 high schools are being counseled and tested each year. Approximately 400,000 boys and girls in public and parochial schools received this service during the 1955-1956 school year. Plans are being made to reach 500,000 young people during the coming school year.

The testing program pinpoints the aptitudes of the individual, and these are related to occupations and professions for which there would be opportunities available. The counselor during the interview urges continuation on to college if the tests give an indication of better-than-average intelligence scores. Information on job opportunities is constantly provided to the counselors by the national and state offices of the employment service. As information on educational requirements and opportunities in the field of social work becomes available, it is sent to the local office counselors for use in developing individual guidance programs. This material is also available on high-school "career days"—local employment service counselors work with the school counselors in the planning of these programs.

In addition to the counseling program for high-school graduates, co-operative agreements between school authorities and the Employment Service are in effect to reach those youngsters who drop out of school. Efforts are made to encourage the youngsters to remain in school or, if this is not possible, to help them in finding suitable employment. Other school programs provide for assistance in securing regular part-time employment, summer employment, and temporary employment.

During the past five years, the Employment Service has intensified efforts to improve its service to professional, scientific, and technical personnel. For many years the unattractive premises of many local employment offices discouraged applicants and employers from using this service. This

Points and Viewpoints

problem was met by securing better locations and more pleasing quarters. In addition, separate facilities for professional and clerical workers have been set up in twenty-eight metropolitan areas. These are in addition to a larger number of offices that provide either separate entrance or separate space for this activity. As a result, more placements of professional personnel are being made at the present time than ever before in the peacetime history of the public employment service. The District of Columbia Employment Service placed three times as many social workers in 1955 as in 1953, and the professional office in Boston doubled its service to that group in the same period.

In a further effort to improve its service to professional, scientific, and technical people, an experimental program was put into effect March 1 in all the New England states (except Maine), New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. Its purpose is to make it possible for a professional applicant who cannot find the opening he wants in his own community to request his local employment office to send his application to any community or a number of communities in any state participating in the program. The same service is available to employers in locating a person to fill their requirements. While the Employment Service has been maintaining a nationwide clearance service, this new plan makes it possible to transmit rapidly complete applicant information or employer requirements from the smallest community in these states to the largest metropolitan area. The installation of modern duplicating equipment in a key city in each state makes this experiment possible. It is too soon to determine whether the program will be successful, and it is not intended to expand the program into additional states until it has proved its merit.

Local community groups of social workers have been urged to develop an employment program for social workers in their communities. Advisory committees have

been organized, meeting on a regular basis. Probably the committee that is best known and has been very successful is the one that has been in existence in New York City for many years. Similar organizations have been formed in the District of Columbia, Chicago, Cleveland, and San Francisco. Informal organizations are in existence in other cities.

All of the efforts being made to raise the professional competence of State Employment Services should bring about still further improvements in their operation. This goal is certainly of interest to members of the National Association of Social Workers. Perhaps the most effective way in which the association can help to achieve this objective is to use the public employment system to the greatest extent possible whenever the need for placement assistance arises. The more the system is used, the better it will become.

A. W. MOTLEY

U. S. Employment Service

Coals to Newcastle

GERTRUDE BINDER carries no coals to Newcastle with her query, "Publicize, Interpret or Relate?" (see page 27). Rather, let us hope she lights up some obscure corners in a highly strategic but frequently foggy area in which social work greatly needs activation: its public relations front. Her ability to highlight many pitfalls in one aerial survey, however, may be just a little too fast for the infantry.

Is it too pedantic to point out that she is *not* suggesting that social work join the Dale Carnegie school of psychological strategy? Industry has been to that school and did develop some public relations techniques there. But industry is profit-motivated, while social work is not. Since social work *does* live with the profit system, it would do well to understand and adapt profit-system language. Its implementation of that language, however, must be in accord with its own unique functions.

Miss Binder is pointing out some profoundly practical premises about public re-

lations for social work. These four are basic: (1) Public relations is always the function and responsibility of top management. (2) One of the most important methods top management uses to create positive relations with the public is publicity. (3) Social work has fallen into an unfortunate habit of using an ambiguous, negative word, *interpretation*, when it means publicity; it should promptly adopt the word *publicity*. (4) *Publicity* employs all the tools of mass communications media in order to relate to the public: press, television, radio, motion pictures, printed material, public speaking, and direct mail.

Since social workers grasp abstract concepts best through case histories, a look at the public relations of the United States Navy might well be rewarding. The Navy, like social work, is not a profit-motivated endeavor. Like some phases of social work, it depends entirely upon the taxpayer's dollar for its support.

Today Navy public relations "is a function of command that contributes to national security by evaluating public attitudes and executing a program of action through the efforts of every unit and individual in the Navy to cultivate and maintain (1) public understanding and appreciation of the Navy's mission and needs, (2) the good will and co-operation of every individual and organization with whom the Navy deals externally in its day-to-day operations, (3) high internal Navy morale, and (4) the respect and understanding of the people abroad for the Government of the United States."¹ Today the Navy assigns Public Information Officers (the military equivalent of publicity men) to almost every ship or shore command. It is the duty of these officers to seek out news about the Navy's mission of interest to the public and see to it that this news is communicated dramatically through mass communication media.

It was not always so. In the early days of our nation, the Navy was weak and gen-

¹ U. S. Navy Public Information Manual, Appendix A, page 157.

erally neglected because Americans were ignorant of the importance of sea power. Navy public relations literally came into being during the U-boat raids just prior to World War I, when a far-seeing Secretary of Navy began holding two press conferences per week in his office. Though public apathy toward the Navy followed World War I long into the depression years, the concept of public relations was kept alive. In 1941 the Chief of Naval Operations recognized it as a function of command. Yet the Navy lost its best opportunity to bring home forcibly to the American people the meaning of sea power during World War II, because it lacked long-range public relations planning. By 1945 it had learned its lesson. Though its best public relations personnel were greatly depleted by demobilization, the Navy saw the need of keeping its mission before the public. It created one continuously effective communications outlet, the Fleet Home Town News Center; it established special ratings for Enlisted Journalists; and it emphasized the importance of public relations in every command by the assignment of Public Information Officers. In 1956 few Americans who read, watch television, or go to the movies lack awareness of the importance of sea power.

Social work may or may not lend itself as appropriately to dramatic presentation as the U. S. Navy. It has, however, the same stem-to-stern need for functional integration of a public relations philosophy. M. E. C.

Erratum

On page 13, line 18, April 1956 issue of *SOCIAL WORK*, ("How Social Will Social Work Be? by Herbert Bisno"), the sentence should read: "Social work, from this point of view, was seen to be moving from a period of *dedicated* but noninstitutionalized enthusiasm in the fight against entrenched evils to a stage characterized by a professionalized worker offering a regularized, necessary social service in a systematic and skillful manner."

Social Work

Civil Defense Welfare Planning

A *Memorandum of Understanding* recently signed by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator provides a means for involving on a clearly defined basis large groups of social workers in civil defense planning with the assurance that the federal department with major responsibility for welfare planning will support such effort.

In the recent past, the federal government has been putting to use, in a rather new sense, a time-tested measure for carrying out responsibilities created under law. In 1950, when Congress placed in the Federal Civil Defense Act the words, "To provide a plan of civil defense for the protection of life and property in the United States from attack" it realized the magnitude of the problem. Quite wisely, the act from which the Federal Civil Defense Administration derives its authority provided, with the approval of the President, for the delegation of appropriate civil defense responsibility to the several departments and agencies of the federal government whose experience and competence justify such delegation. Our lawmakers saw, even then, that the complexity of the task called for utilizing as fully as possible all the available resources and, conversely, for avoiding diligently the paralleling or duplicating activities of other federal departments or agencies.

The administrator of the Civil Defense Administration has to date, with the approval of the President, made formal delegations to a number of federal agencies, among them the Post Office Department, the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, Justice, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Civil defense authorities have devoted a considerable amount of time in

pointing out the value of such delegations. Among these are: economy in operation by avoiding the creation of a large operating staff; the spreading of responsibility through the use of the experience and competence of personnel engaged in similar work; the psychological value of convincing the public that the federal government takes civil defense seriously; reducing the pressure upon local and state governments through the simplification of the federal agencies' approach; and, finally, expanding the normal civilian structure to include permanent preparedness against enemy attack.

The first of such delegations was made to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on July 14, 1954. A number of specific responsibilities were delegated, which, in the course of time, were assigned to the operating agencies within the department, *viz.* the Public Health Service, the Food and Drug Administration, the Office of Education, and the Social Security Administration.

The welfare items in this first delegation were concerned with the planning of programs for providing for emergency financial assistance and emergency clothing to civilians in want as a result of attack. This task was assigned to the Bureau of Public Assistance, a unit within the Social Security Administration, which has a basic social work orientation. Here it was seen at once that a formalized and more definitive statement was needed to provide clarity and substance to the broad responsibilities thus delegated. This statement which is known as a *Memorandum of Understanding* and which becomes an earnest of the relationship established by the original delegation forms a companion piece to it. The memorandum clarifies and interprets the nature and scope of the programs delegated, the extent of the authority delegated, and the basic operating and fiscal principles.

One of the significant features of the memorandum lies in the provision for

transferring to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the authority given in the Civil Defense Act, "to utilize . . . with their consent, the facilities and resources of the states and local political subdivisions thereof and of other organizations and agencies. . . ." This authority creates a basis for "building in" the civil defense welfare program into the existing machinery of the state and local public welfare departments.

William Mitchell, deputy commissioner of the Social Security Administration, in recent testimony before the House Committee on Government Operations, stated: "We now have a public welfare system in the United States that is in operation in every state and in every political subdivision in every state and in the territories of Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. These state and local agencies are staffed by trained personnel, and are in touch with the people of every section, however remote, of the United States. They operate under the rules and regulations of a federal-state local fiscal system for the handling of grants-in-aid moneys."

In addition, the memorandum gives the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare broad authority which the administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration has under Public Law 920, including obligating the federal government, as may be required, to meet the civil defense requirements of an attack or an anticipated attack. It is significant that for the first time the memorandum establishes the basic federal responsibility in the fiscal area which hitherto has been unresolved. This is a policy question that occupied the attention of many officials from the very beginning of civil defense welfare planning. The National Civil Defense Welfare Advisory Committee, composed of representatives of both national public and voluntary agencies, wrestled with this fundamental problem in practically all its early meetings.

Another significant feature of the docu-

ment is that it recognizes the role of the social worker's skill in meeting the volume and variety of needs that may arise from such a national calamity. In describing the program, it recognizes the importance of the provision of essential services in addition to material assistance that will facilitate the re-establishment of home and community life. Thus, the memorandum recognizes not only the broad competence of the many facets of the public welfare structure but also points to the need of involving the skill and resourcefulness of the total social work profession, embracing both private and public agencies. This number, however formidable, are but the nucleus of the vast organization needed to carry this responsibility. It is well known by those who have been exposed to its enormity that the civil defense welfare program poses the greatest challenge to social work of any that it has yet faced. The concept of service to people in distress in a disaster of this magnitude is a binding and solemn charge on the social work profession.

JOHN J. HURLEY

*Bureau of Public Assistance
Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare*

Rehabilitation and Social Work¹

A SURVEY of the services of current rehabilitation programs reveals certain similarities and differences in their practice. These programs may be divided into (1) public vocational rehabilitation services, employing rehabilitation counselors, and (2) rehabilitation services that are part of established medical or health and welfare services such as hospitals and clinics, public and voluntary social work agencies, and privately supported rehabilitation centers. There are broad differences in these various settings as to the role of the social worker and the distinctive content con-

¹ Abstracted from a report on the field of rehabilitation made for the Curriculum Committee at the New York School of Social Work.

Points and Viewpoints

sidered essential to social work functions. Even more basic are differences in agency practice based upon the concepts of values, goals, and scope of rehabilitation, and of the educational preparation seen as necessary.

Some agencies and some influential practitioners regard rehabilitation as a distinct entity of service, differing markedly in terms of the knowledge and skill required from the services of a social agency, from a curative medical care program in a hospital or clinic, or from a vocational agency although having in common with each many concepts, methods, and services. The rehabilitation centers and the public rehabilitation programs express this point of view very clearly.

A contrasting point of view holds that rehabilitation is always a major goal of good medical care as well as health and welfare services. This approach also emphasizes the integration of specialized services, on a community-wide basis, to meet the needs of the total patient.

Both these viewpoints agree that rehabilitation services must extend over a long time and involve extensive planning. From the divergences in outlook and goal, however, flow some differences in the scope of the programs and the methods employed. Some agencies believe that rehabilitation is a process which should begin when the patient first sees a doctor and should be extended until the patient's readjustment to society is accomplished. In this view the family as well as the patient is part of the central focus. In many agencies, however, it is believed that rehabilitation may start after the major portion of curative medical care has been accomplished. In this view service is usually largely patient-focused toward adjustment on the job, at home, and in the community.

Related to these differences of philosophy and approach are the ways in which agencies are organized. One group holds that in rehabilitation the services must be offered through the integration of services

of a team of their *own* specialists—what may be called the "rehabilitation center" approach. Others believe that by the coordination of various direct services, an effective rehabilitation program can occur. This group emphasizes the use of a variety of medical specialties, social services, and community resources.

There are also differences regarding the educational and professional qualifications for the social worker. The established hospital, clinic, or social agency, which sees rehabilitation as an essential goal of all health programs, tends to consider that generic social work education is the sound basic preparation, with certain additions of specialized knowledge about handicaps, disabilities, and their emotional significance to the patient. Knowledge of the functioning of other disciplines and the ability to carry on responsible collaboration and integrated planning are to be gained on the job. Workers in the "rehabilitation center," however, tend to define their programs more in terms of specific rehabilitation goals. In such agencies greater emphasis is placed upon specific content regarding physical handicaps and disabilities; the emotional impact of pain and a changed self-image; psychological testing; work tolerance and the like; and upon specific skills in collaboration with the rehabilitation team of specialists. Most of this specialized knowledge is considered basic to qualification *before* a worker is engaged. Psychological formulations, interpersonal factors, and interviewing skills are to be acquired on the job.

In those rehabilitation agencies where social workers are generally not employed, the content of the counselor's job is clearly defined as embodying much of the knowledge and skill provided by social work education. Persons currently directing such programs, whose backgrounds seldom include social work, express doubt either implicitly or explicitly as to whether social work education can provide an adequate basis for the rehabilitation counselor's

position unless additional knowledge is provided prior to employment. Training in industrial relations, in education, or psychology is often seen as adequate preparation for these positions. A further analysis will be found in the full report (see footnote, page 108).

The areas of knowledge especially needed by social workers in the various kinds of rehabilitation settings would include the following:

1. Work in its psychodynamic and social meaning; industrial organization and attitudes, job classifications.
2. Medical background information, relating especially to the different handicapping conditions, and their effect on patient functioning in work and other areas.
3. Interdisciplinary collaboration on the team and the contributions of other professions in service to the patient.
4. Familial and other interpersonal aspects of recovery.
5. The use of community resources and understanding of patterns of community organization of rehabilitation and employment services, and their relationship to the general health and welfare field.
6. The importance of social work understanding, both in diagnostic and treatment aspects, and in group and individual processes.

Medical and demographic data indicate a marked increase in the elderly section of the population and in the treatment of chronic diseases. Facilities for the curative and rehabilitative aspects of chronic illness undoubtedly will be increasingly incorporated in the structure of community health and welfare services, both governmental and voluntary. Hospitals, clinics, institutions, health departments, and many other types of agencies will develop rehabilitation programs as an aspect of general medical care—along with prevention and cure—rather than as a separate entity. Since the rehabilitation of the patient to improved functioning in activities of daily living inevitably involves an interweaving of psycho-

dynamic and social factors with physical and medical ones, the significance of this development for social work must be underlined.

In the future, most if not all social work programs and personnel will deal with an increasing number of the chronically ill and handicapped in casework and group work agencies, in vocational guidance, in family care and home programs of general hospitals and through a variety of other means.

An additional element of importance to community planning lies in rehabilitation planning for retarded individuals—including vocational guidance, training, and placement—and the establishment of sheltered workshops. Retardation is also frequently found as an accompaniment of physical and neurological disorder—*e.g.*, as in cerebral palsy—and thus is more frequently recognized in hospitals, clinics, and rehabilitation centers. These facts suggest that it is desirable to include in the curriculum of schools a broader view of mental retardation as a social, individual, and family problem, and of appropriate ways in which social work services may be developed.

If this analysis of the coming development of rehabilitation services is a valid one, all areas of social work practice will be considerably affected. Not only will caseworkers and group workers find a greater percentage of ill and handicapped persons in their normal service loads, but community organization workers and agency administrators will need to be equipped to deal with the problems of planning integrated agency services for such groups. Community organization practice involving knowledge of structural interrelationships, public and voluntary patterns of agency services, research techniques, and governmental developments in this field, will come to the fore. There thus may be a role in rehabilitation programs for administrators who have soundly based social work knowledge and experience.

Points and Viewpoints

Although it seems unlikely that there will be an immediate considerable expansion of the use of social workers within public vocational rehabilitation programs, there will probably develop an increasing field for the offering of social work consultation in such agencies, especially with the growing importance of the rehabilitation of psychiatric patients and public assistance clients.

ALFRED H. KATZ

The Hemophilia Foundation
New York, N. Y.

Bryn Mawr Anniversary

"Is SOCIAL WORK education meeting the needs of the times?" This was the question posed at the conference at Bryn Mawr College in May 1955 in celebration of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Carola Woerishoffer Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research. The question is not new, nor were the answers startlingly new. What emerged at the conference, however, was a series of challenges which the times present to professional social work education and a remarkable consensus on the key importance of such education.

The increasing complexity of the problem faced by social work and the developments of the field of knowledge used in social work practice make new demands on social work education. As phrased by one of the speakers in a casework discussion group:

There is evidence that the amount and variety of knowledge needed for casework practice increases with each decade. This is unavoidable because of the nature of the responsibility assumed in social casework and the developments in the fields of knowledge on which it is based. This may be viewed from the perspective of social agency practice with its heritage of concern for a wide area of social, economic, legal, political, and psychological problems. Or it may be approached from the client as a bio-

psycho-social being. In either case the comprehensive nature of the social work task encompasses responsibility for inner and outer needs, for psychological and social problems, for human welfare in broad dimension.¹

Substitute "social work" for "social casework" and the statement embraces the underlying problem of the conference as well as social work education. How to secure and train enough persons with the disciplined intelligence, the emotional maturity, and the compassion required for such a task?

The "needs of the times" which challenge social work education were illustrated frequently in terms that cut across lines of different social work settings and disciplines. A few examples may serve to point up the similarity of problems and the generally recognized need of better communication among all the persons and institutions involved, if solutions are to be found.

The challenge of new communities crosses local and national lines, requires flexible but firmly rooted social work practice to meet it. Newly built communities in the United States without traditions or roots or established relationships (the prevalence of new houses without basements or cellars seems symbolic); villages in technically undeveloped countries where people are awakening to the possibility the modern world offers of freedom from hunger, illness, and despair—these call for the application of the spirit and skills characteristic of the pioneers in social work.

Cultivation of the ability to use a fresh approach to community life is its essence, whether that community is a new suburb in the U. S. A., a village in India, or a slum in process of renewal in a great city. The approach is grounded in the essentials of

¹ Tessie Berkman of the Graduate School of Public Administration and Social Service, New York University, in her opening remarks as leader of one of the discussion groups at the conference.

principles and methods so that the practitioner can slough off preconceived patterns of community life and even of traditional social work resources. He listens, he looks, he waits, he enters gradually into a culture not his own (whether the difference is based on class or nationality); he begins through objective study to discover the real needs and the "felt needs" of the people concerned; he lends support to a family or a neighborhood committee or a council of elders as they wrestle with their problems; or, an approach that is difficult anywhere in the world, he tries to awaken a sense of expectancy so that people will want to deal with their problems instead of merely enduring them. There may be no agency to which to refer a client and the first need may be for seed, a well, or decent housing before individualized service is attempted. What social worker in the United States would not recognize the best that social work has to offer in this tribute paid to the social worker in an Indian village farewell ceremony? "We came to call this U. N. worker our younger sister. She helped us to discover ourselves, and to make us do something for ourselves."

Certainly no professional education in this shrinking world can remain provincial, and the major challenge to the curriculum seems to be not entirely for special courses in, for example, social work in other countries or the U. N. program for international social work, but also for a permeation of the whole curriculum with material that challenges the student to use creatively his basic principles and methods and to keep awake the spirit of curiosity. Here again better communication among social workers and agencies in different disciplines and different countries such as offered through the International Conference of Social Work is in order.

There is need for continuous examination of community needs, for assessment of social work resources, for testing social work methods. The citizen, as well as the social work profession, is concerned with under-

standing the need for and promoting the optimum use of the resources that social work can offer the community. The intelligent citizen is increasingly "research-minded." Are social work executives and practitioners keeping up with him?

Social work research requires not only the direction of specialists, but the co-operation of everyone in the agency. Therefore, there should be provision for some training in research method and, even more important, the cultivation of an understanding of the place of research in professional social work and of the part that should be played by the practitioner in the total research process. Teamwork across the line of specific disciplines, and among agencies, schools, and the public, is an essential area to be covered in such training.²

The public services present a challenge to social workers both to serve in public agencies and to interpret their needs and services to the community at large. Current crises in public welfare present a strange contradiction. Here is a setting that social workers have done much to create, for which social work pioneers labored long, and on which social work organizations have brought pressure for the acceptance of professional standards. Today, with an increasing commitment on the part of public welfare administrations to the employment of professionally trained personnel, the supply of workers is shockingly behind the demand. This is due not only to the general shortage of trained personnel, but also to the preference of many professionally trained workers for what they consider more highly professional settings. Not "Where am I needed most?" but "Where can I find the best supervision?" was said to be the question most frequently asked by graduates considering a position.

Leaders of the profession, equally failing

² For further discussion of research in social work as presented at the conference, see Malcolm G. Preston and Emily H. Mudd, "Research and Service in Social Work," *Social Work*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (January 1956), pp. 34-40.

Points and Viewpoints

the public services, too often have become engrossed in their respective tasks and failed to exercise leadership in bringing to the public the needs the public services are trying to meet, the gaps in service, the necessity for adequate appropriations and trained personnel. As Judge Polier (Domestic Relations Court, New York City) stated:³

It sometimes seems as if there were additional and most seductive temptations offered to people engaged in social work that keep them from contributing what they can and should contribute to meeting the needs of our American community today. . . . That one is engaged in helping people may in itself bring comfort and at times serve as an opiate. That as a professional person one can concentrate on some special facet in the laboratory or in developing new skills may seem to justify one in failing to scatter energies too widely lest one be ineffectual. The hope that the steady raising of technical standards will in time lead to a better meeting of problems may vaguely smother one's concern that new problems are multiplying faster than services.

Thus, from several parts of the conference, came the challenge to see and to interpret "human welfare in broad dimensions" as well as to probe more deeply into its constituent parts. And here again the partnership of social work and the public

was seen as the base for advance on this broad front.

Judge Polier phrased for those attending the meetings the relationship of research, experimentation, and concern for human welfare, and the part played by the public in the meeting of human needs:³

I believe that knowledge carries with it special responsibilities. If that be so, in grappling with the new needs of our rapidly changing civilization, men and women who select for their life work social work or social welfare have accepted a greater responsibility than that which arises from the choice of many other professions. They have the responsibility of leaving the shelter of their professions and applying their knowledge to the best of their ability. They have, however, other responsibilities. They have first-hand knowledge of people who need help, people whom others in the community do not know or see. They, like the physician sent out in times of an epidemic, have the duty to report what they do and what they are unable to do. Like the physician, they have the duty to use the best medicine available and report when it is not available. Individually, they, like other citizens, must be given the right to withdraw to the laboratory for research. But collectively they have the duty to report what areas are uncovered and thus to stir the conscience of the community to action on behalf of its troubled children.

³ Justine Wise Polier, "Social Work, Social Problems and Community Values," *The Social Service Review*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (September 1955), pp. 260-266.

LUCY P. CARNER

Philadelphia, Pa.

Just Off Press—MONOGRAPH III

Concepts and Principles Underlying Social Casework Practice

by Werner A. Lutz, Associate Professor of Social Case Work
School of Social Work, University of Pittsburgh

This is the third in a series of monographs entitled "Social Work Practice in Medical Care and Rehabilitation Settings" sponsored by the Medical Work Section.

National Association of Social Workers, One Park Ave., N. Y. 16, N. Y., Price: \$1.00

BOOK REVIEWS

THE RIGHT TO LIFE. By A. Delafield Smith. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1955. 204 pp. \$3.50.

This small, very human book discusses an aspect of our society so basic, so much a part of its life processes, that social workers often fail to take note of it, like the air we breathe. For A. Delafield Smith is writing of law as a social institution and is meditating on "the ultimate significance of law and a legally ruled environment to our understanding of human behavior and human reactions."

The author, a philosopher and lawyer known to social workers for his years of devoted work in interpreting and illuminating the rights of individuals to public welfare services, begins with the individual human being and the conditions that make his humanity possible. He notes that man's immediate environment is no longer nature but his fellow men, and that his compelling need is for an environment responsive to his demands, in the way that nature itself is responsive to the demands of life. Law is a principal means of insuring this responsiveness and thus of helping to keep man free and not subject to the caprices of his brothers.

Questions that bedevil the social worker about persons' "rights to assistance" and "rights to insurance" fall into perspective when considered against a principle of society's responsibility to promote individual security by making available to all persons by legal means the things essential to maintenance of life. Included in these essentials are work for those in the labor market, food, shelter, clothing, health care, and those services "that tend to develop or redevelop and reconstruct individual capacity," services broadly conceived to cover the range of human needs.

Three stimulating and provocative chapters bring before us questions about the legal status of children and invite us to take a long look at juvenile court theory, the concept of a legal personality as it relates to children, and issues of private personal guardianship. No social worker has to be reminded of the need of every child for his parents, or for a responsive, responsible, enduring substitute. What we may sometimes overlook is the importance of law and judicial procedure in assuring children the protection of a "continuing unbroken personal relationship operating in the context of public controls."

"The professional idea" is defined eloquently and passionately in terms that have meaning to social workers in all settings, public or voluntary. The professional method is seen as slowly transforming our conception of government, substituting itself for the authoritative method in the performance of public functions. Here is set forth a concept of law and government in the service of man, freeing him to create and to hope.

VIRGINIA HYDE

New York School of Social Work

A MANUAL OF INTERGROUP RELATIONS. By John P. Dean and Alex Rosen. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955. 194 pp. \$3.75.

A combination of the practitioner's drive and insight with the patient and searching analysis of the social scientist has produced a volume that makes a truly unique contribution to the growing literature on intergroup relations. Clearly spelled out here are practices and principles which have been groped for and only dimly felt by many well-meaning practitioners. These are documented by scientific findings which

Social Work

Book Reviews

are the result of six years of study by the Cornell Social Science Research Center (made possible by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation) and reinforced by the collaboration of a trained professional worker in community organization for whose work the Russell Sage Foundation gave funds.

This is not a report on the study itself—only here and there are the findings quoted. Instead the emphasis is on a recommended course of action which is at the same time both realistic and optimistic.

The American ideal of fair play is taken as the basis for all motivation for action in overcoming prejudice and discrimination. The argument is that all good Americans accept the principle of fair play, and on this basis step-by-step improvement can be built up—twenty-seven propositions for action are presented. The authors advocate a firm policy of integration as a goal, and taking steps (measured by community realities of apathy, opposition, availability, or lack of leadership) to establish an atmosphere of acceptance of "fair-play behavior."

There is a helpful and sober clarification of the role of the professional worker as advisor of the board rather than as "prime mover" himself. The short chapter on professional growth pleads for participation in the activities of the workers' professional association, council of social agencies, inter-agency workshops as the means for the individual to contribute his knowledge and increase his skill. A plea is made also for realistic co-operation between the practitioner and the social scientist in learning more about motivation of people, stimulation to group action, and evaluation of such practices. Indeed, this book itself is testimony to the value of such co-operation.

Sometimes, it is true, the eager reader wants to know more about the study itself—its methods and the details of its findings. If it could be published without violating confidentiality, it would be most helpful to practitioners who want to stimulate studies

of practices in their own communities or agencies. This reservation by no means detracts, however, from the enormous value of the book with its focus on action rather than exhortation or contemplation.

Those interested in board motivation, staff training, or adult education will use this book as a basis for workshops which the authors recommend frequently. Each individual practitioner will be induced to a frank appraisal of his own concepts and practices, and the social scientist, in turn, will learn from it a new approach to using scientific findings for social action.

From now on there will be no excuse for the naive, well-intentioned approach which disregards scientific findings. There will be no excuse for inactivity either by the fearful or the skeptic who believes that the problem is "too big to handle in our town."

ANNEMARIE SCHINDLER

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.
New York, N. Y.

INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL WELFARE. By Walter A. Friedlander. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955. 683 pp. \$9.00.

This book presents a sweeping overview of the field of social welfare in all its ramifications. Its primary usefulness lies in the field of undergraduate education, particularly in the preprofessional program, even though the author's stated aim is to serve (a) those who wish to serve as volunteers or board members, (b) those who are looking forward to or are employed in positions in the field for which professional training is not always required, and (c) those who plan to take up or are engaged in studies of graduate social work or who are working in the field.

One wonders whether it is possible to meet so many diversified aims within the covers of one volume. The student in a graduate school would seem to need an introduction to his profession different from that needed by the volunteer or board member. Raising this question does not

detract from the admirable breadth and the considerable depth of the presentation, however. It merely indicates some of the difficulties inherent in the organization of this large body of complex material, intended to serve a variety of purposes.

From the point of view of graduate education, one appreciates the extensive coverage of social welfare developments in England and in the United States (Part I) particularly during the most recent periods, but would like to see a more penetrating analysis of the underlying trends and broad principles which emerge from the different ways in which changing needs have been met during the various stages of societal development. Contributing to this unevenness is the difficulty inherent in the author's organization of material which makes it unavoidable that historical aspects are interspersed in the numerous chapters of Part II (the present system and its organization) rather than brought together in Part I.

Most welcome is the emphasis placed on such topics as international social welfare, public housing, industry and crime, delinquency, and corrections. The frequent use of case material, while sketchy at times, adds likewise to the usefulness of the volume. This reviewer has some reservations about the discussion of the public services because it does not sharpen up sufficiently some of the basic principles underlying and guiding our public welfare services.

For future editions, it is hoped that the author would review the appropriateness of the treatment given the difference between the so-called diagnostic and functional schools of social casework. Can a discussion limited to three pages do justice to the underlying psychological formulations? The value of identifying by name those who are considered major proponents of each "faith" is questionable, particularly since the composition of these lists is rather controversial.

Because of its breadth and scope, how-

ever, this volume represents a welcome addition to the introductory literature so needed in our field, and should prove most useful to many groups if used judiciously. Some minor mistakes (such as the incorrect statement about the author of the first Pittsburgh survey) cannot mar the over-all impression of the importance of *Introduction to Social Welfare*.

PAUL SCHREIBER

Hunter College School of Social Work

BRIEFLY . . .

GOVERNMENT AS ENTREPRENEUR AND SOCIAL SERVANT. By Henry J. Abraham. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1956. 62 pp. \$1.00.

This tract places government ownership in the United States in perspective, and does the same for public social services. Useful to social workers concerned with functions of government, the pamphlet calls attention to points of great debate, and to principle and philosophy. Some details of organization and procedure should have been omitted, for this is not useful for reference or as a handbook.

J. W. C.

MINORITY GROUPS: SEGREGATION AND INTEGRATION. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955. 110 pp. \$2.25.

This collection of papers given at the 1955 National Conference of Social Work covers a wide field, including work with the Indian, the migratory worker, desegregation in schools, steps toward an integrated agency program. The brevity of each article whets rather than satisfies the appetite of the reader who is looking for help in problems confronting him. But it gives a survey of work done on many fronts and helps keep the practitioner informed.

ANNEMARIE SCHINDLER

Social Work

Book Reviews

come
re so
most
usly.
rrect
first
er-all
duc-

IBER

CIAL

ash-
2 pp.

ship
and
ices.
with
calls
and
tails
have
for

7. C.

NTE-
Uni-

the
York
with
egre-
ated
arti-
etite
o in
es a
and

OLER

ork

HEALTH, CULTURE, AND COMMUNITY. Edited by Benjamin Paul. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1955. 493 pp. \$5.00.

Here a social anthropologist presents case studies of sixteen communities representing a wide cultural range, three of them in the United States. The authors, mainly anthropologists and sociologists, describe successful and unsuccessful attempts on the part of health teams from the outside to gain acceptance for modern health practices. The aim is to reinforce the principle that in order to help a community improve itself you must learn to think like the people of that community, that innovations must make sense within the existing framework of traditional practices and beliefs.

The studies are presented according to a uniform pattern: problem, situation, implications, summary, and selected references. This method facilitates comparison, underscores the central theme, and describes each culture as an entity, particularly the way in which its traditions and beliefs shape the community's attitude toward modern health practices. The annotated references offer additional help toward understanding each of the cultures considered. The last chapter, prepared by Dr. Paul, further illuminates the dynamics of culture, a unique human phenomenon, by contrasting it with social organization which exists in lower forms of life, notably insects. He points up the pitfalls of ethnocentricity for all who attempt to understand those different from ourselves.

Because many researchers and health workers will want to be guided by the principles reiterated throughout the book, it is regrettable that more of the methods were not described by which the communities were studied and the data, crucial to the success of the projects, were obtained. Perhaps this task requires a second volume.

The book makes an important contribution to the growing literature of applied social science and will be profitably studied by social workers. A familiar concept, to

begin where the client is, is given a new dimension, applicable to both the community and the individual, with respect to the force of a group's traditions and beliefs.

Syracuse Dispensary
Syracuse, N. Y.

LEONE RENN

BRIEFLY . . .

THE FOCUSED INTERVIEW. By Robert K. Merton, Marjorie Fiske, and Patricia L. Kendall. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956. 186 pp. \$3.00.

The focused interview is a specialized research tool aimed at reinstating and ascertaining the subjective reactions of interviewees who have previously been involved in a particular situation. Among its purposes are better specification of the stimulus and improved interpretation of statistical findings. The authors provided a most thoughtful and well-documented manual of problems and procedures, based largely on a wide range of experience in research on mass communications. L. S. K.

RICHMOND PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTE of the COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

—O—

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

—O—

Graduate Professional Education
Leading to the Degree of Master
of Science in Social Work

Fall Semester Begins September 12, 1956

Applications now being received.
Catalogue will be sent on request.

For further information, write to

The Director
800 West Franklin Street
Richmond 20, Virginia

ADMINISTERING A HOSPITAL SOCIAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT: CONTENT, PRINCIPLES AND RELATIONSHIPS. By Celia R. Moss. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Medical Social Workers, 1955. 84 pp. \$2.00. Available from the National Association of Social Workers.

The special usefulness of this book is to be found in its beginning effort to examine the many faceted aspects of administering a social service department within the broader administrative framework of a hospital setting.

Social workers concerned with administration will welcome widely the general content. In addition, specific points concerning administrative content, principles, and relationships are presented. These represent an initial step in analyzing problems by splitting them into understandable components.

Using William Newman's *Administrative Action* as a selected frame of reference,

Mrs. Moss applies the following classification of operations: (1) planning, (2) organizing, (3) assembling, (4) directing, (5) controlling, (6) performing nondelegated activities, to an orderly assessment of administering hospital social service departments.

As these practical aspects of administration are developed, recognition is given to the particular structure and organization within which social work philosophy is applied. It is a neat task, indeed, to present material, as Mrs. Moss has done, which considers the triad factors operating in philosophy, function, and structure.

This book is a very real contribution to social work literature on administration. Future investigation and testing of other administrative concepts should be a natural outgrowth of this splendid beginning.

JULIA G. HURST

United Hospital Fund
of New York

*What are the relationships
between occupation and other life aspects?*

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF OCCUPATIONS

By Anne Roe, *Research Psychologist, New York City*. This first systematic attempt to interpret occupational life in terms of individual dynamics offers new insights into psychological variation among people in different occupations. It builds on the assumption that, within limits, occupational choice may be taken as an indication of some aspects of *self image*. One of the book's most useful features is its exploration of the dynamics of this self-classification. At the same time, the author has structured the whole field of relationships between occupation and other areas of life, pointing up a general pattern and basic principles.

For the psychologist or sociologist, this book provides new and rewarding perspective on such matters as normative development, educational theory, social background factors, and occupational choice and satisfactions. The vocational guidance worker or the personnel manager will find that it offers all the available data on psychological differences among people in different occupations.

June 1956.

340 pages.

Illus.

\$6.75

Send today for an examination copy.

JOHN WILEY & SONS, Inc., 440-4th Ave., New York 16, N.Y.

THE GIVE AND TAKE IN HOSPITALS. By Temple Burling, Edith M. Lentz, and Robert N. Wilson. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1956. 355 pp. \$4.75.

This study of human organization was conducted in six representative voluntary general hospitals. Any who have attempted scientific study of human relationships can appreciate the magnitude of the task assumed by the team composed of a psychiatrist and two social scientists. The social scientists were "outsiders," by intent, in the belief that a more objective view can be achieved than by persons "who already had strong feelings about . . . hospital life." A social-anthropological approach was used in the study of all levels of personnel from board members to laborers. The book is different than would have been written by an "insider" of an occupational group about itself. The observations are keen and much was learned that few hospital employees reckon with in interpersonal relationships.

Status problems, areas of conflict, motivations, and dissatisfactions are presented freely. The dilemma of the nursing staff and "the hospital power structure" are discussed straightforwardly. The authors present "the unique distribution of authority among board members, the administrator, and the physicians" as a "triad of relations" that affects more than the three "top agents." Perhaps the most light is thrown on the complex problem that faces any hospital administrator.

The specific chapters on occupational groups and major departments should be read in the context of the purposes of the study. The observations regarding the occupational groups should be helpful to social workers who work in close contact with such personnel but also to those in position to influence persons seeking hospital employment.

The full validity of the generalizations is hard to judge as there have been few studies even for one occupational group of

the factors highlighted in this study. The interviews with social workers were perforce fewer in proportion than with other occupational groups found in all hospitals. On the whole, observations regarding social workers are sympathetic and typical; but the "fresh look" taken by the team is provocative. This reviewer regrets that the bibliography did not include representative literature of the social work field.

GRACE WHITE

*Upstate Medical Center
Syracuse, N. Y.*

BRIEFLY . . .

SCHOOLS OF PSYCHOANALYTIC THOUGHT. By Ruth L. Munroe. New York: The Dryden Press, 1955. 644 pp. \$7.50.

Dr. Munroe, a practicing psychologist, has written one of the best books to date giving a critical overview of the main streams of psychoanalytic development. She comes to her task with unusual preparation as scholar, as psychologist, who herself uses many of the concepts and techniques discussed in the book. This is not an easy book to read. The text is chopped up with as many headings as a questionnaire; there is both repetition and overlapping. Nevertheless, one does get a clear idea of "intrinsic dynamisms of different types of systems." The basic orientation is that of "Freud" and the "Freudians," but there are objective analyses of Adler, Horney, Fromm, and Sullivan. Jung and Rank are less fully treated. Dr. Munroe understandably is not able to reconcile the points of view of the individual-functioning-in-a-culture, as opposed to biologically determined trends of the personality, but she does wrestle with this difficult problem. One should not be put off by the 644 pages. There is an excellent index.

G. H.

A HANDBOOK OF HOSPITAL PSYCHIATRY—A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO THERAPY. By Louis Linn. New York: International Universities Press, 1955. 560 pp. \$10.00.

The motivation for this comprehensive, lucid, up-to-date volume is revealed as the author's concern for the manifold nature and crucial importance of the responsibilities assumed by the physician in the psychiatric hospital. The reader is impressed and moved by his recognition of "the paradox that the most complicated of all psychiatric tasks and the greatest responsibilities are often placed on the shoulders of the physician who has only recently entered the field of psychiatry and is yet unprepared for the burdens he is to carry." Addressed, therefore, mainly to the psychiatrist the book deals of necessity with each member of the treatment team. That this review will deal narrowly with points most directly affecting the social worker should not require elaboration. Over and above considerations of professional competence, which would affect vast areas of the content of this book, is the necessity for selectivity. This assumes particular urgency in a thirty-eight chapter work including the following: seven chapters each dealing with one method of psychiatric treatment, six chapters each devoted to a member of the treatment team, twelve describing as many categories of patient problems, eight on different areas of specialized hospital problems, and five on areas of community problems.

The goal of a practical handbook, which necessitates a fragmentation of content in the interest of easy location of material for study and reference, is achieved by Dr. Linn without loss of unity of the work as a whole. The integrating factor lies in the author's philosophy of the "therapeutic community" which places prevention and cure of mental illness at the basis of all areas considered. From this follows both an emphasis on the therapeutic utilization of all existing resources and a willingness to examine new methods and facilities.

Although the pages devoted explicitly to psychoanalytic theory are proportionately few, the entire work is permeated with the depth of understanding growing out of this body of knowledge in keeping with the author's position that "psychoanalytic theory provides at present the frame of reference which appears to me most useful in describing the therapeutic community and planning its program."

Dr. Linn is concerned with the reality that "almost one half of all the personnel currently supplying social services in mental hospitals have had incomplete training or none at all." Although not made explicit by him, this may explain the elementary nature of the chapter on "The Social Worker." In any case, the major portion of his material is taken up with a brief, simple delineation of the traditional services offered at each point in the process of psychiatric treatment: intake and reception; taking a social service history and the period of active treatment; and finally preconvalescent, aftercare, and family care. Dr. Linn stresses the financial savings through "the economics of good social work," encourages the use of social workers in psychiatric research, and makes some observations on the training of social workers.

There is a great deal about this chapter which leaves the social work reader dissatisfied. Rather than utilize this space in elaborating points that would be obvious to the reader, I should like rather to examine this dissatisfaction which we frequently experience when members of other professions comment on social work practice. The annotated bibliography which Dr. Linn appends to each chapter attests to assiduous inquiry and wide acquaintance with vast numbers of publications. One can only assume therefore that if the practice of social work is presented by him with less accuracy or completeness than is pleasing to us the fault lies not in our stars but in ourselves. To be specific, the difficulty probably grows out of the absence of a comprehensive, easily located literature

Book Reviews

providing essential definition in terms satisfying to us.

Some of the most interesting references to the use of social service are hidden in the chapters outlining the psychiatrist's responsibility to the community (particularly the chapters on "Relatives of Patients," "Out Patient Care," and "Family Care"). That in many instances no rigid line between the responsibility of the psychiatrist and social worker is drawn in these chapters is probably desirable at the present time in the interest of developing a broad social perspective in the young psychiatrist to whom the book is addressed. This may best be achieved by encouraging him to gain first-hand experience with the problems encountered by the patient outside of the hospital environment. Nonetheless, one cannot but wish that the social worker's long experience with these problems had been emphasized. In particular, the failure to mention Hester Crutcher's classic volume on *Foster Home Care for Mental Patients* creates a puzzling lack in the otherwise excellent chapter on family care.

Dr. Linn recognizes the importance of graduate social work education and has the courage to suggest that "ideally every mental hospital should be affiliated with a school for social service." He is clear, however, about the gap between the ideal and the reality and as a remedy suggests that the social work technician program, as developed in the United States Army, be applied in civilian psychiatric hospitals. In other words, he feels that some process of identification of social work and non-social work components in the job in the psychiatric hospital would make possible the establishment of some workable division of labor. With due recognition of the value of case aide programs, particularly as a recruitment device, one would wish that Dr. Linn had stressed instead measures for increasing the supply of workers with full graduate education. Instances could be cited wherein such measures have led to a flow of trained social workers in psy-

chiatric hospitals, namely the post-World War II program in the Veterans Administration and programs in certain state systems such as California and, more recently, Ohio.

Social work has for many years been engaged in a process of incorporating psychiatric understanding into its practice. The spirit and content of Dr. Linn's book point to a broadening of the psychiatrist's perspective to include social factors and community responsibility. Both movements point to a potentiality for increasingly effective teamwork in serving the needs of the mentally ill in and outside of psychiatric hospitals.

TESSIE D. BERKMAN

Graduate School of Public Administration and Social Service
New York University

BRIEFLY . . .

CHURCHES AND SOCIAL WELFARE (2 vols.).

New York: National Council of Churches, 1955. *The Activating Concern, Historical and Theological Bases* (Vol. 1). By E. Theodore Bachman. 128 pp. \$3.75. *The Changing Scene, Current Trends and Issues* (Vol. 2). By Horace Cayton and Setsuko Matsunaga Nishi. 224 pp. \$3.75.

These two volumes, concerned with the churches and social welfare, were prepared for the Cleveland Conference on this subject held in the fall of 1955. The first volume describes the kinds of welfare activities engaged in by thirteen Protestant denominations and their respective historical and theological bases. The second volume presents a summary of recent changes in the social scene, the significance of professionalization of social work and the churches' adaptations of their welfare programs in the light of current trends and issues. Both volumes are richly informative regarding the social welfare interests and activities of the Protestant churches and the significance of these for the total field.

L. W.

THE INITIAL INTERVIEW IN PSYCHIATRIC PRACTICE (with phonograph records). By Merton Gill, Richard Newman, Frederick C. Redlich, in collaboration with Margaret Sommers. New York: International Universities Press, 1954. 423 pp. \$6.00.

Drs. Gill, Newman, and Redlich have written a detailed and provocative book describing their approach to and their technique of the initial interview. Their book is a reflection of their own thinking, practice, and research and, as one would expect, it is an objectification of some of the best practices in current initial interviewing.

The authors open their book with a summary and analysis of literature dealing with the historical evolution of initial interviewing. From this survey they demonstrate a movement toward the point of view and technique they subsequently describe. There is also a frank discussion of some of the problems of tape recording for both the patient and the interviewer. The

major portion of the book is devoted to three exceedingly interesting tape-recorded interviews with a microscopic discussion of the interplay between doctor and patient. They add much to the written presentation.

The point of view of the book is understandable and the conclusions drawn are inevitable when viewed in the light of the evolution of dynamic psychiatry. The authors emphasize the importance of establishing rapport and in engaging the patient in a relationship. They do not subscribe to the strictly anamnestic point of view which does not emphasize the importance of the relationship between doctor and patient as a medium through which content flows and a medium through which many of the patient's attitudes and patterns of behavior are reflected. They feel that the interview situation can be used as a sample situation and laboratory for determining the patient's capacity to form a relationship, his motivation in coming for treatment, and his capacity for treatment. The interviewer's activity is directed toward listening to and permitting the patient's story to unfold with the interviewer only augmenting the unfolding in terms of the patient's own productions. Such a method demonstrates that the problem of what is relevant can be solved by believing that the patient is the best guide to what is relevant to his problems. The interviewer's activity also extends to reinforcing the patient's drive for treatment. Subscribing to this point of view, the authors recommend giving up "systematic inquiry into specific sectors of the life history or even of the current status."

The writers, however, do feel that there should be an "appraisal" in the course of the initial interview that would lead to an understanding of the patient's psychological status as well as some insight into any extrinsic factors that might interfere with treatment. Such an appraisal would presuppose a "diagnostic attitude." In the authors' shifting the word "diagnosis" to "appraisal" one wonders whether much is

UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK



GUIDE FOR FIELD PRACTICE
Revised Edition—\$1.00

Write the Secretary, University
of Buffalo School of Social
Work, MacDonald Hall, Buf-
falo 14, New York.



gained. Perhaps it is more important to define how one uses the word "diagnosis." Does it have to be used only when a total evaluation is considered or can it be a partial evaluation in terms of the unfolding of the patient's own story? Does the technique and content recommended simply imply a shift from the old diagnostic, anamnestic approach to a dynamically conceived approach which involves a psychological anamnesis instead of an historical one? Does it represent a different order of fact-finding looking for certain psychological data instead of historical data? Is this perhaps a shift from symptom orientation to personality orientation? Such a point of view, however, must in a large measure depend for its success on the experience and understanding of the interviewer. Otherwise such a frame of reference might be used in a form just as inhibiting to the spontaneous production of the patient as was seen in the fact-finding approach.

The three interviews reported illustrate this very clearly. The third interview seems to represent the most successful use of the technique described. It develops easily and naturally in terms of the patient's own needs under the guidance of a warm, understanding, experienced therapist. It is particularly striking because the patient is psychotic. In the first interview a woman patient seemingly abandons her projection and recognizes her own role and struggles with an alcoholic husband. One wonders if this technique represents a real recognition or is simply a masochistic surrender to an interview which the patient experiences as a sadistic attack. Confession of an illegitimate pregnancy at the end seems to indicate how much guilt had been mobilized. The second interview demonstrates how much the inexperience of the interviewer interferes with the free flowing of content and how the complexities of the countertransference can interfere with the spontaneous unfolding of the patient's story.

Many aspects of this book are of special interest to social workers. The use of the relationship as a sample situation, the shift to personality orientation which inevitably brings one to relationship orientation, and the concept that the patient is the best guide to what is relevant to his problems are but a few examples.

LOUISE L. BANDLER

Simmons College School of Social Work

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNS IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH (revised edition). By F. Stuart Chapin. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955. 297 pp. \$4.50.

Four chapters have been appended to this already classic and useful discussion of cross-sectional, projected, and ex post facto designs for evaluative study of community programs. The new chapters deal with assumptions underlying analysis of variance, nonparametric statistical methods, elaboration of the ex post facto design, and problems in psychosocial measurement. Also added are revisions of the Social Status Scale and the Social Participation Scale plus an attempted rebuttal of a number of critical book reviews directed at the first edition. The basic limitation, well recognized by Chapin, is failure to randomize treatments in the designs he describes. His concession that the randomization principle cannot be employed in the community situation is unfortunate. That either statistical manipulation by matching methods or replication of studies can compensate for nonrandomization remains questionable. To permit the reader the possible impression that a nonparametric technique is now available which is free of any assumption of random sampling is unpardonable. In the hands of competent instructors, however, this book will continue to serve as an excellent introduction to problems of "experimental" research when carried out in the community.

LEONARD S. KOGAN

New Mental Health Books

LIPPMAN

TREATMENT of the CHILD IN EMOTIONAL CONFLICT

By Hyman S. Lippman, M.D.

Based on the author's 25 years' experience at the Amherst H. Wilder Clinic, the book reflects his warm, human and particular interest in problems of neurotic illness, character disturbances, and delinquency in children. Dr. Lippman emphasizes the TEAM approach of the child psychiatrist, case worker, clinical psychologist and group therapist. "... a must for all workers dealing with troubled children."—says William C. Menninger, M.D.

291 pages, 5% x 8%, Indexed.....\$6.00

STEVENSON

MENTAL HEALTH PLANNING for SOCIAL ACTION

By George S. Stevenson, M.D., Sc.D.

"There is more scientific knowledge and technique for dealing with mental illness than is now being used." This is the challenge Dr. Stevenson presents. How we can use our current knowledge to a fuller extent and toward better results is set forth in this thorough and wide-ranging book.

358 pages, 6 x 9.....\$6.50

LEMKAU, 2nd Edition

MENTAL HYGIENE in PUBLIC HEALTH

By Paul V. Lemkau, M.D.

The book discusses the technical procedures used in carrying out mental health programs, the relations between the various professions concerned, and the training and function of each.

450 pages, 6 x 9.....\$8.00

— ORDER HERE PLEASE —

Blackston Division, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.
330 West 42nd St., New York 36, N. Y.

You may send me on 10-day approval:

- | | |
|--|--------|
| Lippman—Treatment of the Child in Emotional Conflict | \$6.00 |
| Stevenson—Mental Health Planning for Social Action | \$6.50 |
| ... Lemkau—Mental Hygiene in Public Health, 2nd Ed. | \$8.00 |

Name
(Please Print)

Address

City Zone ... State

SW 7/56

BUILDINGS OF TOMORROW—GUIDE FOR PLANNING SETTLEMENTS AND COMMUNITY BUILDINGS. By Fern M. Colborn. New York: Whiteside, Inc. and William Morrow & Company, 1955. 159 pp. \$3.50.

Far-reaching contemporary population movement in America has caused wide spread relocation of the facilities of recreational and informal educational agencies. Neighborhood deterioration, slum clearance, movement to new areas of groups traditionally served, and city replanning have impacted neighborhood centers with especial force.

Fern Colborn has performed a valuable service to settlements and similar agencies in preparing this practical little book summarizing the new building experience of settlements. In it she lucidly describes the characteristics of recently built buildings and distills innumerable useful suggestions for those concerned with new community structures. The author starts with planning the building and proceeds to such matters as making the new building practical, working with the architect, organizing for the task within the agency, raising funds, and relationships to public agencies. Studded throughout are useful "tips" on procedures during the planning and construction period, building layout and materials, and related factors.

The book contains gleanings from experience with such specifics as office space, gymnasias, special interest shops, lobby areas, storage space, and outdoor facilities. It offers creative approaches to the use of building materials such as cinder block, glazed and ceramic tile, glass, floor coverings, and lighting. The author wisely cautions as well as advocates with respect to these items. In dealing with layout, she soundly focuses on the importance of adequate control and supervision as related to entrances and traffic flow. She treats also the roles of the executive, architect, and board building committee in planning and executing the new building.

Book Reviews

PLAN
UNITY
New
Mor-
50.
lation
wide
recre-
encies.
clear-
groups
nning
with
uable
encies
sum-
ce of
es the
dings
stions
unity
plan-
such
prac-
izing
ising
ncies.
" on
con-
ma-
a ex-
pace,
obby
ities.
se of
lock,
over-
isely
ct to
she
ade-
d to
also
and
and

In discussing planning, Miss Colborn presents an approach which while thorough in many respects is disappointing for its impression of planning *for* a neighborhood, rather than *with* it. Though soliciting suggestions from neighbors is referred to, the opportunity is not utilized for their full involvement along with board and staff in the total planning process. The approach to planning the building also would be stronger were there more stress on the basic nature of the *program* as the determinant of facilities.

Among other reactions evoked by this book are the following: First, an effort to avoid overbuilding must be so balanced as to assure that building standards are not depressed and that sound structures are erected. Second, good equipment planning for the new building is of great importance and stress must be given to its being started along with construction itself. Third, planning for the opening and operation of the

new building is a major task which likewise must begin early in the construction period and be skillfully executed.

Over-all, this is a most useful book in an area of wide current interest. Miss Colborn is to be congratulated on providing the field with a valuable working guide.

SANFORD SOLENDER

*National Jewish Welfare Board
New York, N. Y.*

SPECIAL PREPUBLICATION OFFER FOR NASW MEMBERS

Social Work Year Book 1957

RUSSELL H. KURTZ, editor

Before January 1, 1957 \$6.00 (List Price, \$7.50)

For discount, payment must accompany order.

National Association of Social Workers

One Park Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

The George Warren Brown School of Social Work

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

St. Louis 5, Missouri

Master of Social Work

A professional two-year curriculum. A generic first year; a specialized second year in family casework, child welfare, medical social work, psychiatric social work, social group work, public welfare administration, social welfare organization, social work research. Scholarships and stipends are offered on a competitive basis.

Doctor of Social Work

A professional degree based on a research concentration.

Early inquiry and application advised.
For further information, write to The Dean.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY School of Social Work

Graduate Programs
for Men and Women
leading to Degree of
Master of Science in
Social Service

Social Group Work

Social Casework

Scholarship aid brochure describes
Ina L. Morgan scholarship, Boston
University Human Relations Center
fellowships and other stipends or
loan funds.

For all information write to Dean

School of Social Work
264 Bay State Road
Boston, Mass.

THERAPY IN THE SCHOOL

Dr. Altmeyer's article in the April issue ("Public School Services for the Child with Emotional Problems") presents a thoughtful review of an area where help can be given to children but where the services actually provided fall far short of the need. However, I feel compelled to differ with him about the inadvisability of undertaking psychotherapy in a school setting. Certainly one of the great contributions we can make to the educational system is in sensitizing teaching personnel to the understanding of disturbance in children and handling the child in a helpful way in their classrooms. Dr. Altmeyer recommends a sort of "talking to" teachers about this, but how much more effective is "working with" in effecting lasting, meaningful learning?

Those of us who have carried on therapy within the school know that this is not only possible but has many distinct advantages. In the day-to-day sharing of referral, planning, and treatment problems, many educators have gained a real awareness of emotional difficulties, and the school's climate of feeling about children who present problems has changed radically.

The accessibility of the clinic and children to each other makes possible continuance of treatment for troubled children who would never be reached by more remote community agencies. Far from being a deterrent to treatment, the clinic in the school often can provide the suspicious, defensive child with a familiar frame of reference to which he can relate. If the school, the therapist, and the patient can see the educational difficulties as symptoms of deeper conflicts and anxieties, an invaluable entrée into treatment is provided.

The tremendous mental health needs of our time compel us to transcend traditional barriers and to offer therapy in a variety of settings. So for those of us who work in

schools, we might well accept the old motto, "Brighten the corner where you are."

AVEL O. GOLDSMITH

*Three Schools Project, P. S. 37
Bronx, N. Y.*

SCIENTIFIC METHOD

I have read Herbert Bisno's article, "How Social Will Social Work Be?" with much interest. It seems to me that he states most of what is wrong with social work, but he is in favor of what is wrong with it!

In his summary he lists three "indictments," which I shall have to quote in order to make my point: "First, a continuing de-emphasis on controversial social action which has broad social implications; second, a related lessening of attempts to influence social policy and the acceptance of the role of technician-implementer; and third, change in the ideology of social work that will lessen the gap between its system of ideas and that of the dominant groups in society."

I venture to guess that a social worker can back any plan for intelligent service for which he can marshal rational evidence and that he will evoke respect by the "upper classes" which Mr. Bisno seems to hold in contempt. But he cannot be absurdly emotional about a program which lacks a sound factual basis. Mr. Bisno seems to be arguing that human beings are equal. Equal in what sense, Mr. Bisno? The only one I can think of is the right to cast a vote and have it counted as one vote! From the point of conception they are destined to be different in neural structure and, consequently, functional efficiency with respect to culture, human relations, and adjustment to the physical environment. Why should not social workers recognize this? Why should we not be critical of stupid policy as well as selfish policy? Social workers will gain respect as they use scientific method to im-

Letters

prove both their ideas of program and their concepts of technique and skill. And they will have to surrender to neither the "upper classes" nor the "lower classes," because they will cease to think as politicians and think as intelligent members of a learned profession.

R. CLYDE WHITE

Western Reserve University

I appreciate Professor White's interest in my article and I am pleased to have an opportunity to reply to his letter.

I would like to make it very clear, at the outset, that I did not state, or imply, that human beings are similarly endowed or that stupid policy should be supported.

In respect to the genuine points at issue, I would maintain the following propositions: (1) policy does not inhere in data; (2) policy determination, while certainly influenced in some instances by scientific evidence, also involves conflicts of interests and ideologies, and power differentials; (3) the influencing of public policy, in relevant areas, is a legitimate and necessary professional activity of social workers; (4) the influencing of public policy necessarily implies involvement in the political process (but not necessarily as a professional politician); (5) the interests and policies pursued by the dominant socio-economic class (power elites) in our society often do clash with the interests and aspirations of the majority of our population. After all, contrary to a popular myth of our day, what is good for the directors and controlling stockholders of General Motors is not necessarily good for the United States.

It might also be noted that the above propositions are supported by a rich store of empirical studies.

A picture of society in which policy automatically emerges from scientific data and is devoid of other considerations is, also, a picture of society devoid of reality.

HERBERT BISNO

University of Oregon

SHORTAGE OF SOCIAL WORKERS

I read with interest the comments on the shortage of social workers by Emerson Holcomb in the April issue of *SOCIAL WORK*.

As a woman social worker who has worked a good many years before and during marriage, I am not convinced that the turnover in social agency staffs is due primarily to the marriage and home life of women social workers. But I welcome the suggestion of attracting more men to social work. Improvements in attitudes, salary scales, working conditions, equipment and office space, advancement opportunities, and the quality of supervision will do a lot to make jobs more attractive to women workers as well as men. Male colleagues on social agency staffs make the job more interesting, and should help eradicate old concepts of social workers as dedicated spinsters or well-to-do reformers.

I accept the principle that capable, ambitious persons with responsibilities should

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

The basic **Two-Year Graduate Curriculum** in social casework or social group work prepares for professional social work practice in all fields. It leads to the degree of Master of Social Work.

The **Advanced Curriculum** offers to qualified persons who hold a Master's degree in social work an advanced, third year of graduate professional education in social casework, group work, welfare organization, supervision, administration, teaching, or research. This curriculum leads to the Advanced Certificate.

The **Doctoral Curriculum** for candidates for the degree of Doctor of Social Work includes, and continues beyond, the Advanced Curriculum in any one of its specializations.

Fellowships are available to students in all curricula.

Address all inquiries to:

(MISS) MARGARET E. BISHOP

Director of Admissions and Placement

School of Social Work

University of Pennsylvania

2410 Pine Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

The Catholic University of America

NATIONAL CATHOLIC SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE

A graduate professional school offering in the Nation's Capital a unique preparation for the many careers in the social services.



Address: The Dean, National Catholic School of Social Service. Catholic University of America. Box 1421, Washington 17, D. C.

University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work

Pittsburgh 13, Pa.



PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION for men and women

*Leading to the Master of Social Work and
to the Doctor of Social Work Degrees*

The Master Degree may be earned with either the **Work-Study Program (Plan A)** or the **2 year full-time program (Plan B)**

The Doctorate program emphasizes teaching, research, and administration

find suitable recognition, both monetary and otherwise, in social work jobs as well as in other occupations. However, this should not be limited to persons of the male sex, or include females only if without responsibilities. For good staff morale, workers should feel wanted, rather than tolerated, or under threat of some kind of penalties if unforeseen events should cause changes in their lives. Social agencies can do a great deal more to bring their personnel practices to the point where able staff members will want to stay, whatever their sex, marital status, or home situation may be. It has been pointed out frequently that more married women are working now than ever before, and that probably our society is becoming such that women will have not only the privilege, but the responsibility to work and bring in income, in addition to taking care of home and family.

The comments of Elizabeth Crawford on "Why Probation?" in the same issue of the magazine seem very pertinent to this whole question. Improvement is needed in the way staff and administration regard each other. . . . I speak here not of individual administrators, but of the attitudes reflected in personnel practices and official pronouncements of agency policies toward personnel.

I would like to see, in addition to the steps suggested by Mr. Holcomb, some indication of agency administrations' looking within themselves, as well as to staff, for ways to improve recruitment and maintenance of staffs. The reasons that workers decide to leave, and the steps they take in arranging to make a change, are a long time developing. We will have taken a long step toward qualifying to be called a profession when administration and staff can work together on their problems in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and respect, rather than waiting until the moment of separation to try to find out what happened.

Daly City, Calif.

BETH C. BALENT

Social Work